The Princeton Theological Review

JULY, 1919

THE CRISES OF CHRISTIANITY AND THEIR SIGNIFICANCE

As oppositions of contraries lend beauty to language, so the beauty of the course of the world is achieved by the opposition of contraries, arranged as it were by an

Christianity is at a crisis. This does not mean that she is decreasing numerically. Over 570,000,000[2] persons avow themselves Christians. Neither does it mean that she is calling in her outposts. Every considerable country is being occupied by the missionaries of the cross. Nor yet does it mean that at home she is losing interest in social progress. As never before sociology is her study and philanthropy her passion.

What is meant is that while developing her philanthropy, she is detaching it from the church and even from Christ. A constantly growing number of Christians are advocating and are themselves supporting "welfare work" which is intentionally and often ostentatiously non-religious. What could be more suggestive, more alarming? The bouquet of roses is both beautiful and fragrant. In a day or two, however, its perfume will have gone and its beauty will have departed. It must be so with flowers that have been picked from the living bush. Can it be otherwise with social or charitable movements which have separated themselves from Christ, even if they have not in terms repudiated him? At best they are but flowers that have been picked.

Again, the crisis of Christianity appears in this, that while her missionaries are multiplying, their gospel, it would seem, here and there, little by little, is being depleted and emasculated. Such is the warning that has been coming to us

---

[1] *City of God,* I. xi. c. 18.

from Japan. Such is the warning that is now coming to us from China. Such is the warning that is beginning to come to us from other fields. Could anything be so appalling? We have been wont to look on our Foreign Missions as the demonstration that the church is obeying her Lord's last and great commission to 'go into all the world and preach the gospel to the whole creation.' But what if the gospel which *some* missionaries preach is 'another gospel which is not a gospel'? This would prove treason both in the council tent and on the firing line.

In short, the crisis of Christianity is seen in this, that while gaining in quantity, she is losing in quality. Five facts, among many, demonstrate this.

One is the neglect of the Sabbath. What is known as the Continental Sabbath has come to be, with some exceptions, the universal Sabbath. The day is still kept, but it is kept as a holiday rather than as a holy day. Physical and mental recreation and social enjoyment are coming to be recognized as its chief purpose. In few places is it yet regarded as a day to be wholly set apart from secular to sacred uses, from the service of God in the affairs of this world to his service in worship and in "the things of the Spirit". The effect of this change of view is as radical as the change itself is general. Religion languishes in proportion as church-rolls lengthen. It must be so. Deny a community time to eat, and they lose their vigor. Take from the church the day given to her for feeding on the milk and the meat of the Word of God, and may she hope to develop or even to retain her strength?

Another fact indicative of the waning influence of Christianity is the passing of family worship. This symptom is more alarming than the related one just noticed. The family is the unit of society. Biologically speaking, it is the cell through the multiplication and development of which society lives and grows. Scarcely anything, therefore, could be more serious than any deterioration of the family in purity and influence. But how can the family escape

deterioration, if it neglects God in whom it "lives and moves and has its being"? And what neglect of him on the part of the family as such could be so decisive and, consequently, so fatal as the disuse of the altar of the home?

A third symptom and proof of the crisis to which our religion has come is the general disbelief in, and, indeed, the common inability even to conceive of, "the divine order of human society". That God has constituted and is developing and perfecting such an order is to most but an idle tale and to some an absurdity. The state has no deeper foundation than the "Social Compact". The church was never more than a voluntary association. The family is merely a temporary arrangement, once, perhaps, convenient, but now often decidedly inconvenient. And as to a "kingdom of God", in which these, as all else, should find their goal, their reason, and their norm—this is a pitiably transcendental imagination. What hope can there be for society from the Christian standpoint when its very bases are thus overthrown and trampled under foot?

A further fact, more significant and more serious, is that, in increasing numbers, Christians are beginning to adopt the world's view of the Bible. From the first this view has denied the supernatural origin and the infallible authority of our Scriptures. Instead of holding them to be a direct communication from God himself, it insists that they are only a natural evolution of man's religious nature. Now the church is adopting this view. It has not yet modified the historic creeds of Christendom; but it is the view of not a few private Christians in almost every communion. It is taught from the pulpit by ministers whose ordination vows bind them to defend and to teach the contrary. It is diligently and insidiously propagated by theological seminaries which were founded and endowed to maintain and to disseminate the opposite. What does this mean?—that the Church is throwing away her God-appointed and God-given food and that she is doing this as she goes into her great conflict. Must it not be so when she puts the "Word

of God", which is her "Word of Life", in the same class with the Koran of Islam and the Vedas of Hinduism?

The final fact demonstrative of the crisis of Christianity is the spread of a world-view which must make belief in God and in Christ as God irrational and his service absurd. The gist of this way of regarding the universe is that it substitutes the world for God. Whether, as monism, be it materialistic or idealistic, it identifies the two, or as pluralism, it makes God a part, though it be the best part, of the world—the result is the same. God is taken from his throne and is stripped of his prerogatives. No longer does he "do according to his will in the army of heaven and among the inhabitants of the earth." If he exists at all, it is by sufferance; and the next step, it would seem, must be to declare man's religious nature, which cries out for "the living God", a lie. Such is the crisis to which Christianity has come.

The reality of this crisis has just been emphasized by the war and is being yet appallingly emphasized by its consequences. This is the great, if not the all-absorbing, fact at the present moment. War, we are told, is the contradiction of Christianity. It is the triumph of hate. War and our religion, consequently, cannot coexist. Did not our Lord himself say, "By this shall men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another"?[3] According to Christ's own words, therefore, nations that are at war cannot be his disciples; and as the powers just emerging from war—and that the most awful war of all history—include much the larger part of Christendom, what must be the inference?

Nor is this a novel situation. Most of the wars as well as the greatest war of modern times, have been between Christian nations. It is not necessary to substantiate this statement. No truth of history is more conspicuous. The conclusion which many are drawing from it would seem to be as obvious. Modern wars, and preeminently the war

[2] Pres. Board of Foreign Missions.
[3] St. John xiii. 35.

just over, mark the collapse of Christianity. They are the demonstration of her inability to prevent what must be the destruction of her true spirit and life. This is the deepest significance of what, not inaccurately, we call "The War."

Could anything indicate more strikingly and terribly the crisis to which Christianity has come? Her doctrinal foundation would seem to have crumbled; her ethics would appear to have collapsed. Her end must be at hand. What is worst is that Christians themselves are too dazed to resist, even if, indeed, they can realize the seriousness of the situation.

That we may regain our poise as well as come to feel that our Lord Christ is still on the throne, it will be well to remind ourselves that it is no new thing for Christianity to reach a crisis.

She was born of a crisis, even of the apparent defeat and actual death of her Founder and Head. The crucifixion was followed by the resurrection and was in order to it; and both were followed by the descent of the Holy Spirit and the constitution of the Christian Church on the day of Pentecost and were in order to these. Now this, the most tremendous of all crises, was not only the beginning of the history of Christianity; it was also and specially the type of it. Christianity has again and again met crises, and the result of each crisis has been advancement proportioned to the seriousness of the crisis.

Such, for example, was the issue of the martyrdom of Stephen. For upwards of six years Christianity had been, on the whole, in favor. She had grown steadily. "About three thousand" were added to the Church on the day of Pentecost. Not long afterward the number of men who believed was found to be "about five thousand". Soon we are told, that "believers were the more added to the Lord, multitudes both of men and women"; again, "that in those days the number of disciples was multiplied"; and once more, that "The Word of God increased, and the number of the

disciples multiplied in Jerusalem greatly, and a great company of the priests were obedient unto the faith".[4]

The whole situation, however, was suddenly changed. Hitherto such persecution as there had been had proceeded from the Sadducees. Now an event occurred which aroused the anger of the Pharisees, and thus stirred up against the infant church the hostility of the whole Sanhedrin. The occasion of this crisis was the advocacy by Stephen of the freedom of the Gospel. This brought against him and against his sect the new charge of disloyalty to Judaism. False witnesses were produced who accused him of blasphemy against Moses and even against God. He was arraigned before the Council; his defence was unconciliatory and unsatisfactory; he was immediately stoned to death: and the result was that "a great persecution arose against the church which was at Jerusalem; and they were all scattered abroad throughout the regions of Judea and Samaria, except the Apostles".[5] That is, only a few years after the birth of the church of a crisis which must have appeared to make that birth impossible, she came to another crisis which threatened her destruction through her dispersion.

What was the issue?—"They that were scattered abroad went everywhere preaching the word."[6] As Dr. Purves wrote, "Christianity discovered its intended destiny and attained its universal and complete message to mankind."[7] The martyrdom of Stephen and the apparent collapse of the Church which it at once produced became the necessary steps to Paul's world-wide work and the world-wide conception of the Gospel. Thus the significance of this second great, and, as it must have seemed, fatal crisis in the Church's history was that, in the words of Neander, it was "the boundary line of a new era, both of the outward and inward development of Christianity."[8]

---

[4] Acts ii. 41; Acts iv. 4; Acts vi. 1, 7.
[5] Acts viii. 1.
[6] Acts viii. 4.
[7] *The Apostolic Age*, p. 55.

With the beginning of the fifth century our religion came to another crisis. On the one hand, luxury, corruption, vice, were rampant. The wealth of the Roman nobles was exceeded only by their selfishness. The poverty of the poor was surpassed solely by their indifference to it. In both classes ambition seemed to be dead. The rulers sought merely to relieve the want and to arouse the idleness of an innumerable people who, as Gibbon remarks, "considered the circus as their home, their temple, and the seat of their republic." On the other hand, the northern barbarians were thundering at the gates of the Imperial City. For the first time in 619 years the seat of empire was violated by the presence of a foreign enemy. Alaric and his conquering Goths were at hand. The most splendid civilization that the world had known was in collapse.

Christianity was held responsible for all this. Why had she not availed to arrest the corruption of the populace, even if she could not herself purify it? Nay, why had she suffered her own garb to be thrown over this corruption and then permitted it thus veiled to attach itself to her? Why was it that the enemy had devastated Italy and was even forcing the gates of the capital itself? Had not these great and manifest evils befallen the nation and the Church under Christian princes and under Christian princes who were, for the most part, diligent observers of the Christian religion? In a word, was not the appalling situation then existing—the conquering Goth without and corruption within—was not this situation the demonstration of the failure of Christianity? Such was the crisis that she faced after 400 years of triumphant progress. It seemed as if she must be crushed under the ruins of that magnificent empire which she had conquered, but which she could not save.

Note the issue. No more than at either of the crises already observed had God forsaken his own. At the turning point itself stood the divinely sent deliverer. The taunts and gibes of the unbelievers Augustine answered, and the despair of the Christians themselves he overcame. He

pointed out that there had been a misconception of their standpoint. What though the Roman civilization should pass away? The grace of God was the great blessing, and it was not confined to any one civilization. The ancient notion of the state as the highest good must yield to the idea of the kingdom of God. To advance this, and not Roman aggrandizement, had been the divine purpose in the development of Rome itself. St. Augustine, in his 138th Letter to Marcellin, when comparing the effect of Christianity with the civic virtues of the ancient Roman republic, finely remarks: "Thus God showed, in the example of that flourishing empire of the Romans, how much the civic virtues could effect even without the true religion, that it might appear evident that men when this is added, became the citizens of another state, whose king is the truth, whose laws are love, and whose duration is eternity." This spiritual standpoint the great North African theologian set forth in his magnum opus, *The City of God,* not only the ablest of the patristic apologies, but one which has never been surpassed. Its effect was seen in the centuries of faith which followed, and in a spiritual conception of the Church's nature and mission which even the darkness of the Middle Ages could not wholly obscure. Such was the result of the third great crisis in the history of Christianity. Not only did she meet it successfully. It was through it that she attained to a true vision of the real "City of God".

Coming now to the tenth century, we find ourselves in the darkest age of the church's history. As another has said, "it was a period of such frightful chaos in church and state as has never since been equalled or approached".[9] 'The "Holy Roman Empire" had fallen; and with its fall, Christianity, if she gained freedom from entangling because worldly alliances, lost security, energy, and imperial eminence. That is to say, with the ceasing of the world-empire she ceased to be the world-religion. She was thrown on

[8] *The Planting and Training of the Christian Church,* p. 57.

[9] R. S. Storrs, *Bernard of Clairvaux,* p. 32.

her own resources; and these were, or appeared to be, utterly inadequate. Thus she could not stem the inrolling tide of barbarism. Learning was despised. Art was neglected. Armed enemies also burst with unrestrained fury on the enfeebled Church as on the struggling but dismembered State. The African Saracens pillaged the coast of the Mediterranean. The Northmen pierced into France. The ravages of the Hungarians were yet more widespread and dreadful. The Slavonic Wends and Czechs had denounced dependence on the Empire and now threatened its frontiers. Fear was so general as to tend to social and governmental atrophy. Sismondi writes that "in reading the scanty records one is struck by a prevailing feeling of solitude".[10] "Harvests were unreaped. Forests widened. Wolves ravaged Aquitaine. Herds of deer seemed to have taken possession of France".[11] General anarchy prevailed. As Bryce has remarked, "The grand vision of a universal Christian empire was utterly lost in the isolation, the antagonisms, the increasing localization of all powers; it might seem to have been but a passing gleam from an older and a better world".[12]

All this could not have been without its effect on Christianity itself, and especially on the Church. The fact was that the civil disturbances just referred to were followed by religious dissension, decline and degradation still more appalling. At Rome herself, the centre of Christendom, the vilest vices of Tiberius and Caligula reappeared. As Dr. Storrs has remarked, "The annalists of the Roman Church stand aghast before it".[13] "The Pornocracy", or reign of harlots, is the terrible name by which a part of it is more accurately described. We pass over the record as unfit for decent, not to say, Christian ears. Suffice it to add that despair settled upon all Europe. A belief in the immediate return of Christ for judgment took possession of men. In harmony with this the gloomiest portents seemed to appear

[10] *Hist. de Francaise*, tom. III. p. 279.
[11] Michelet's *Hist. de France*, tom. I, p. 397.
[12] *Holy Roman Empire*, p. 79.
[13] *Bernard of Clairvaux*, p. 47.

in heaven and earth. The lands were deluged with the perpetual rain. A famine followed more awful than had been known. So many died that they could not be buried, and so great was the scarcity of food that cannibalism prevailed and human flesh was sold almost openly in the markets.[14]

But why prolong the agony of recital. The recuperative power of Christianity again reasserted itself in a way to evince yet more clearly its supernaturalness. In the very desperateness of her situation she saw and grasped her opportunity. The world-empire, as we have seen, had vanished; but the world religion had not died. Thrown on her own resources, it seemed as if she must die; but this became the occasion of her supremacy. What the Church and the Empire had combined to accomplish, the Church would now attempt by herself and in so doing would subordinate to herself even the Empire.

Nor was the man wanting who should thus exalt the spiritual or what passed as the spiritual. The crisis found him waiting. Indeed, what led up to the crisis had prepared him as well as it had prepared for him. In a word, Hildebrand was the man for the time because he was the man of the time. He had grown up in its corruption. He had breathed its despair. He had become so convinced of the failure of the Empire that he realized that the unity of Europe could be restored only by aggrandizing the Pope. And this he did. This was his work; this was his life: by this work and this life, at least for the time being, he saved Christianity, and through Christianity civilization. Thus out of the Church's despair was born and reared he who should exalt her, not to the side of the Empire, but to the place of the Empire. Was not this a complete recovery? nay, much more?

Yet it led to another and—could that be—more dangerous crisis. Exalted as God's viceregent, the Papacy usurped his sovereignty. Though "no one can forgive sins but God only", the Popes, because they were vicars of Christ, as-

[14] R. Glaber: *Hist. sui temporis,* lib. IV. cap. 4.

sumed to do so. Boniface VIII, however, originated the idea of jubilees. In order to celebrate the close of the thirteenth century fittingly at Rome he promised absolution from all their sins to all who should in penitence visit the Church of the Apostles. This brought a concourse of two hundred thousand people to Rome and proved a large source of revenue to the Holy See. His example was followed by his successor. At first every fifteenth, and later every twenty-fifth was proclaimed jubilee year. Moreover, instead of actual attendance at Rome for the sake of obtaining absolution, the payment into the Church's treasury of the cost of the journey was permitted as sufficient.

At first indulgences, as they were called, were granted in remission of only part of the penance imposed by the Church for sin; afterwards they were issued as plenary remission for the whole of it; and finally it became the custom to give them in anticipation of the sin and the imposition of the penance. This awful usurpation and abuse of the divine prerogative was brought to a climax by Leo X. In his zeal to adorn Rome with good art and particularly to complete the Church of St. Peter he undertook to raise the necessary funds by the sale of indulgences. What God would do freely for all who were penitent and what only he could do for any, a mere man, a sinful man, in some cases a notoriously wicked man, claimed to be ready and able to do for all who would pay for it, and claimed, also and worse, that no one but himself and his delegates had authority and power to do so. Was there ever tyranny equal to this? Not only was it assumed that the grace of God could be purchased for money, but also that only the Pope kept it on sale.

Yet again, the deliverer had been prepared and was at hand. By a long course of training the providential nature of which we now see clearly, Luther had come to believe that by faith alone and not by works of righteousness, still less by gifts of money, shall "the just live". For the proclamation of this revolutionary doctrine, which is the very heart of the Gospel, the formal and general teaching of in-

dulgence became the occasion. Nor was this all. The result of the controversy was that Luther planted himself firmly on the Bible as the Word of God and demanded for all the right to search and to interpret it for themselves. Could emancipation have been more thorough? Thus it was the crisis of the Reformation that established "the glorious liberty of the children of God."

Passing over many decades (because of the limitation of time) we come to a yet more serious crisis in Christianity's history. In the year 1736 the Rev. Dr. Joseph Butler, than whom a calmer, more judicial, more discerning philosopher never lived, complained, in the Advertisement of his great work, *The Analogy of Religion Natural and Revealed to the Constitution and Course of Nature,* as follows: "It is come, I know not how, to be taken for granted by many persons, that Christianity is not so much as a subject of inquiry; but that it is now at length discovered to be fictitious. And accordingly they treat it as if, in the present age, this were an agreed point among all people of discernment; and nothing remained, but to set it up as a principal subject of mirth and ridicule, as it were by way of reprisals, for its having so long interrupted the pleasures of the world." This complaint, after fifteen years of further observation and reflection, in 1751, Dr., now Bishop Butler, virtually repeated in his charge to the Clergy of Durham, his diocese, which charge he opened by lamenting "the general decay of religion in the nation, which is now observed by everyone." "Besides the decline of religious influences, the number of those who profess themselves unbelievers," he says, "increases, and with their numbers their zeal."

The crisis thus described was more serious than any one of those just depicted for this reason. The crisis which arose on the death of Stephen was rooted, as we have seen, in bigotry; and the question was whether the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free could be maintained in the face of Pharisaic legalism and narrowness. The crisis which called forth Augustine was, as we have observed, created

and sustained by the corruption of the age and even of the Church. But for this, the northern barbarians could not have devastated Italy, and still less could they have sacked Rome. And the issue at stake was whether, amid the awful sensuality of that period, the spiritual conception of Christianity could be restored, whether the Roman city and civilization could be replaced by the City of God and the Kingdom of Christ. The crisis which evoked Hildebrand and made him Gregory VII was, as we have noted, the product of the despair consequent on the overthrow of the Holy Roman Empire that paralyzed the Church no less than the State; and the point in doubt was whether either had any future, whether "the end of all things was not at hand." The crisis that produced Luther was the result of the usurpation and tyranny of the Pope, and the issue was whether the sinner should have free access to God or whether he could come to him only through the successor of St. Peter.

The crisis however that we are now considering originated neither in bigotry nor in corruption nor in despair, nor in spiritual tyranny, but in reason. This was the significance of it and the seriousness of it. The narrowness of the Pharisees, the foes of Christianity had repudiated; the corruption of the Romans, they abhorred or professed to abhor; the despair of the tenth century they passed over as unworthy of the attention of thinking men; the spiritual tyranny of the Papacy they could not condemn too vigorously: but the Rationalism of the 17th and 18th centuries at least claimed to proceed on the principle on which Christianity herself was founded; for Christianity is the religion of the Λόγος and the Λόγος is divine reason. The question at issue, therefore, was radically different from what it had been. Then Christianity was contending with error. Now she was assailed in the name of the truth. Besides this, the opposition, if not persecution, was thoroughly organized, was long sustained, and came from several quarters and in various forms. Beginning in the 17th century, its full line and its real purpose were not unmasked until the 18th. Dif-

fering within itself as widely as English deism and German pantheism and French atheism differ among themselves, it was, nevertheless, one movement in its exaltation of reason above Scripture, and in its open and violent and often coarse antisupernaturalism. If it did not always or usually deny God, it did invariably dethrone him. It subjected him to the world that he had made. That he could interpose in it to save or even to help it—this it pronounced as unnecessary or as impossible as to enlightened reason it was inconceivable.

Yet Christianity, as she has done before, survived this crisis and took a long step in advance because of it. Assailed on grounds of reason, she triumphed by means of the same. This was notably so in England. John Howe met the pantheism of Spinoza with his *Living Temple.* Ralph Cudworth replied to sensationalism with his *Intellectual System of the Universe.* Robert Boyle established his famous lectureship to prove the truth of the Christian religion against infidels. Biship Butler wrote his great *Analogy* to show that no objection could be brought on grounds of reason against Christianity as the supernatural religion which did not bear just as much against the deism of the day.

Nor was this all. Another and independent, but as really rational movement was in progress. While Butler was writing his *Analogy,* a little company of the ablest as well as the most godly scholars at Oxford were organizing the "Holy Club". They chose John Wesley the Creator or "Father" of it. Their aim at first would seem to have been the sanctification of learning. In it, as in all else, they would do the will of God. But this aim was soon broadened. God, they saw, would have them live, not for their own perfection alone; he would have them seek that in the service of others. Hence, they devoted themselves to works of charity. Nor did they stop with this. What work of charity could be so pleasing to God or so helpful to men as the free proclamation of the free grace of God. And so the Methodist revival began. It was, in the last analysis, the result of the consecration of the culture, the scholar-

ship, the genius for organization, the most uncommon common sense, and the unique initiative of John Wesley to the cause of Christ. What was the issue of this two-fold movement led by Butler on the one hand and by Wesley on the other, this combined defense and propagation of Christianity on grounds of reason? Nothing less than modern missions. By proving that our religion, because the supernatural one, was fitted to be and ought to become the universal religion, and by showing, through the preaching of it to all, that it could "save unto the uttermost", it impressed on the Church, as it had not been impressed on her since the Apostolic age, the Saviour's last and great commission, "Go ye unto all the world and preach the gospel to the whole creation." Such was the issue of what we may, perhaps, call the fifth great crisis is Christianity's history. Instead of exposing the gospel as either a forgery or an idle tale, it secured its proclamation unto the ends of the earth.

And now we have come to yet another crisis. It is like that just noticed in two respects. The opposition to our religion is both antisupernaturalistic and rationalistic. As has been remarked, whether monistic or pluralistic, it insists that nature is all, and it maintains that to hold that there is a being who is above nature and who, though also in nature, is independent of it, is unreasonable.

But this crisis differs from all proceeding it also in two respects. The opposition to Christianity now is usually courteous. Persecution, at least of a physical sort, is unheard of. Denunciation is uncommon. We are told that it is not Christianity herself but certain adventitious and non-essential elements that are objected to. All honor is shown to Christ, if only his deity be not insisted on. The Gospels are given the first place among the Sacred Books of the world, if only their teaching of a gracious and supernatural salvation be expurgated. Indeed, the present attack on our religion is largely by those who claim to be the only true Christians and to make their attack just because they would save Christianity. Hence, the unique

seriousness of the crisis. As never before the Church is in danger of being deceived as to the issue.

The other difference between the present crisis and those before it is that now the assault is much more extended and general. In the eloquent words of Professor Henry B. Smith, words even more appropriate than when he uttered them, "The main characteristic of the present attack upon, and defence of Christianity is that it is all along the line. Forces that have been gathering for centuries are concentrating simultaneously. Systems of science and philosophy hitherto at war have made peace with each other that they may attack the common foe, Christianity. History in its process of recovering all the records is in many quarters trying to undermine our historic basis and many of the so-called philosophies of history and civilization attempt to explain the whole course of human history without God and without Christ. Almost all of the sciences, in some of their representations, are constructing a theory of the earth and of the heavens, of the origin and growth of all life, at war not only with the Scriptures, but also with the first principles of natural theology, of ethics and of all rational psychology—scouting not only the dogmas of faith, but the dictates of reason; rejecting not theology alone, but all metaphysics; denying all final causes, all consciousness, all intelligence in the first cause of finite being, and leaving only a blind unconscious force as the source of an unconscious development, whereby everything is educed out of an inscrutable void in which all is to end."[15]

Have we not in this situation what is most serious? The Church is in danger not only of being deceived by the smooth words of her adversaries; she is bewildered because their deceptive advances are from every side. Nor is this all or the worst. While thus deceived and bewildered, the war-cloud has burst upon her and she is stunned. Again we ask, What of the issue?

This review shows, that it is no new thing for our

[15] *Apol.*, p. 11.

religion to meet a crisis; that these successive crisis have been increasingly serious; and yet that Christianity has survived them, and in every case has, in consequence of them, advanced proportionately to their seriousness. The question, therefore, at once arises, Will she not do so again? Observation and experience have taught us that, other things being equal, what has occurred is what is likely to occur. It is on this basis that we make our plans and regulate our lives. Why should it not in the present instance continue to be the ground of our expectation; and we look with a higher degree of confidence, for such a revival of evangelical and of evangelistic religion and for such a manifestation of its power in the regeneration of society, as the result of the present well-nigh universal war, as never yet has blessed the church and the world? Surely, in view of history, such an attitude is more reasonable than the unbelief and the pessimism which are now so prevalent.

There is a further and not unimportant consideration which should be mentioned. The present crisis might have been and should have been anticipated by Christianity. On the ground of her own teaching it should have been expected. She affirms the existence of a great spirit of evil, "the devil, the prince of darkness, the God of this world, the spirit that now worketh in the sons of disobedience."[16] She represents him, not as omnipotent, but as inconceivably powerful; not as omniscient, but as cunning beyond our comprehension; not as omnipresent, but as ubiquitous. She teaches that the devil is not alone; but that he is the head of a kingdom of darkness, of demons of varying and vast resources, of "principalities, powers, world-rulers of this darkness, the spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenly places."[17] She holds, further and chiefly, that between him and God there can be only unceasing opposition; that this opposition has been concen-

---

[16] Eph. ii. 2.
[17] Eph vi. 12.

trated by the devil on Christ, 'the only-begotten and well beloved Son of God', "in whom dwells the fulness of the Godhead bodily", and who was manifested to "destroy the works of the devil." Finally, she describes him as the great, the implacable foe, the adversary of the Church, which is "the body of Christ, the fulness of him that filleth all in all."

What, then, could be so likely as that the recent missionary activity of the Church, both at home and abroad, should call forth fresh opposition on the part of the devil, just as the earthly mission of our Lord became the occasion for an unpredecented manifestation of Satanic energy and hate? If the war be regarded as such a manifestation—and doubtless, most Christians are ready so to regard it—should it not have for us a message even of encouragement? If Christianity were not making headway, one special reason for activity on the part of "the prince of the powers of darkness" would be lacking. The very fact, therefore, that the hosts of evil are arrayed against our religion as never before might well be in her favor. It might indicate that, as never hitherto, she has become formidable. It might warrant the conclusion that she is beginning to occupy the earth. At all events, what is happening, and especially the present awful war, is just what might have been expected to happen at such a juncture in view of her own teaching as to a great and cunning spirit of evil whom Christ came to destroy. This consistency between Christianity's teachings, and particularly her predictions, and her development, is worthy of the most serious consideration. It would seem to stamp her with "The broad seal of truth".

Nor should the increasing power any more than the renewed activity of the enemies of Christianity dismay us. They might be expected to grow in ability as she grew in influence. If she is "the wisdom of God", she must strengthen men intellectually more than any earthly philosophy or science; and this, whether she makes them good or

not. She will train, as she has trained, the thinkers of the world; and so, as her influence becomes wide and powerful, will men be qualified for the wrong as well as for the right. Nay, further, as an efficient nurse may have many battles with the child who could never have continued to contend with her but for her faithfulness and skill in resisting him; so, that it has been reserved for nations developed by Christianity to manifest a unique genius for war, is again merely what was to have been anticipated. Indeed, the devil himself is one of the great proofs of Christianity. None but a supernatural religion could have called forth and then trained opposition so skilful, so determined, so horrible as his. Thus, even the life-destroying machines of modern battlefields, so far from disheartening us, should even encourage us. They are just what was to be looked for. Only supernatural resistance could have developed such skill in destruction even in the devil. But it would certainly have developed this, there being a devil. Precisely, therefore, because of what most appalls us in the war, may we not, must we not, look for the abolition of war through the triumph of the Prince of peace? In a true sense the wails still going up from the battlefields of a continent herald his victory. As the great adversary could never have been driven to such lengths, so he could never have acquired such ability, had he not been hard-pressed by him who, because he is all-powerful and all-wise and all-righteous, must reign until he shall have put all his enemies under his feet.

"Finally", then, 'let the Church be strong in the Lord, and in the strength of his might. Let her put on the whole armor of God, that she may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil.' "For our wrestling is not against flesh and blood, but against the principalities, against the powers, against the world-rulers of this darkness, against the spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenly places. Wherefore take up the whole armor of God, that ye may be able to stand in the evil day, and having done all, to

stand. Stand, therefore, having girded your loins with truth, and having put on the breastplate of righteousness, and having shod your feet with the preparation of the gospel of peace; withal taking up the shield of faith, wherewith ye shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the evil one. And take the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God." Such is the significance of the crises, and specially of the present crisis, of our religion.

WILLIAM BRENTON GREENE, JR.

Princeton.

THOMAS CHALMERS

"The most marked mathematical forehead I ever met with—being far wider across the eye-brows than either Mr. Playfair's or Mr. Leslie's." So thought Scott's biographer, John Gibson Lockhart, as he sat one Sabbath in the Tron Church observing the countenance of the great preacher. Chalmers himself, when once asked by a friend what he thought himself fitted by nature to be, replied earnestly, "a military engineer." It would be interesting to run through the list of celebrated mathematicians and discover how many of them have been also great defenders of the Christian faith. I think of Newton, the friend of the stars and the expositor of the Apocalypse, and Blaise Pascal, the author of the "Thoughts" and still rated as one of the twelve great mathematicians. Most of the authorities on Chalmers agree in saying that had his whole strength and energy been devoted to mathematics he would have been a great genius in that field. Certainly his astronomical sermons, and, for that matter, nearly all of his printed discourses, show a range of imagination that could count the number of the stars. That mathematical sense for distance, for the spatial tracts of the universe, is clearly evident in his presentation of the Gospel and gives to his sermons not so much the tone of depth as of height. When one puts down a sermon by Chalmers one feels that Christianity is a big thing. "The exceeding greatness of His love toward us" is as marked a quality in the preaching and writing of Chalmers as it is in that of St. Paul.

This predilection for mathematics appeared when Chalmers was a student at St. Andrew's University where mathematics and *Edwards on the Will* were his favorite studies. It is not strange then that it was the greatness of God as the Creator and Upholder of the universe, rather than as the Author of eternal salvation, that engaged the enthusiasm of the young student. Years after he had left

the University we find this entry in his journal: "O that He possessed me with a sense of His holiness and love, as He at one time possessed me with a sense of His greatness and His power and His pervading energy! I remember when a student of divinity, I spent nearly a twelvemonth in a sort of mental elysium, and the one idea which ministered to my soul all its rapture was the magnificence of the godhead and the universal subordination of all things to one great purpose for which He evolved and was supporting creation." An amusing record of the survival of his penchant for mathematics is seen in the fact that when the new manse was built at Kilmany he laid out the grounds in geometrical figures. In his journal we find him confessing to the sin of vehemence against his horse as he was riding one day from Kilmany to Kirkaldy. The horse threw him so often that his mathematical bent began to assert itself and he fell to estimating the relative length of intervals between each fall and calculated how far a dozen falls could carry him. But the tenth fall was so severe that he abandoned the project and told his servant to dispose of the beast as best he could, but to conceal none of his faults. A horse with such a record found no buyers, and Chalmers finally traded him to a neighbour for a volume of Baxter. Whether it was the *Saints' Rest* is not related.

About the year 1790, if you and I had chanced to wander around the schoolhouse of the parish of Anstruther (spoken Anster) on the southeast coast of the country of Fife, we might have come upon a big-eyed lad of ten sitting in the coal hole and studying in its dirt and gloom the lessons for the neglect of which he had been banished to that place of punishment. Not long, however, will he have to stay in that pit, for although he often neglects his lessons he can get them very quickly and very thoroughly when once he applies himself to them. The lad in the coal hole is none other than Thomas Chalmers. His great grandfather was the minister of Elie, but his father and grandfather were ship owners and general merchants in the village of An-

struther. He was born on March 17th, 1780, being the sixth of fourteen children. At two years of age he was committed into the hands of a nurse whose deceitfulness and cruelty long haunted him. He was but three years old when he was glad to escape the cruelty of his nurse by being sent to the parish school. There he had for his master a Mr. Bryce, a poor teacher but an efficient flogger. His sight was beginning to fail when Thomas Chalmers appeared as a pupil, but his thirst for flogging survived the loss of vision. Stealthily would he creep behind a row of his victims listening for a sound that merited the rod. But the lads had arranged a system of signals whereby the boy who sat across from the threatened quarter would warn the one over whom the sightless tyrant had raised his rod, whereupon he would slip out of his seat and the blow fell on the hard and unflinching desk. He had for an assistant and successor a Mr. Daniel Ramsay who was as easy as his predecessor had been severe. Discharged from his post for an unfortunate act he was plunged in poverty. Dr. Chalmers remembered him and from time to time contributed to his support until his dying day. In later years this schoolmaster was wont to boast of two things; first, that he had been the teacher of Thomas Chalmers, and second, that he had received a letter from the Duke of Wellington in answer to one of his own in which he had said that the way to cure the ills of Ireland was "to take the taws in the tae hand and Testament in the tither."

At an early age Chalmers showed a marked predilection for the pulpit, for when he was only three he was found one evening walking up and down in the nursery and repeating the words of David's lament, "O my son Absalom! O Absalom, my son, my son!" And as a child he would often get into a chair and preach to his brothers and sisters, taking for a text, "Let brotherly love continue." At twelve years he was matriculated at St. Andrews' University. There in that venerable University whose walls are washed by the

blue waters of the German Ocean and whose town is filled with the memories of John Knox, Wishart and Hamilton, the future king of the Scottish pulpit commenced his intellectual preparation. For the first two years most of his time was spent playing golf on the famous dunes, football and handball, at which last game he was unusually proficient, being left-handed. His third term at St. Andrews marked his mental awakening. He began to take that interest in mathematics which never quite forsook him. At the age of fifteen he was registered as a student in divinity and was soon engrossed in the study of *Edwards on the Will.*

Even as a college youth he gave promise of his future power. It was a custom for the students in theology to lead the public prayers in the University hall and the people of the town would flock to the hall to hear the prayers of this lad of sixteen. During these years he wrote a composition on the enthusiasm of Christianity. In November, 1842, more than forty years after the eulogy was penned, Chalmers and four hundred ministers of the Established Church were met in convocation at Edinburgh to deliberate on the disruption which was to cost them their homes and their living. It was a great day in the history of the Church in Scotland, indeed, of the whole Church, and when their leader sought to stir them to an enthusiasm equal to the occasion, he turned to that essay of college days and pronounced it with an effect that was overwhelming.

In 1798 Chalmers became a private tutor in a gentleman's family. In this work he was altogether unhappy. He was subjected to many affronts, and when he showed his independence, was charged by his employer with pride. Chalmers answered him thus:—"There are two kinds of pride, sir. There is the pride which lords it over inferiors, and there is that pride which rejoices in repressing the insolence of superiors. The first I have none of—the second I glory in." At the age of nineteen he was licensed by the Presbytery of St. Andrews. It was contrary to the rule to license

before the age of twenty-one, but a ministerial friend pleaded for him as a "lad o' pregnant parts." His first sermon was preached in a chapel near Liverpool. His brother James was one of the auditors and thus spoke of the sermon to his father. "His mode of delivery is expressive, his language beautiful, and his arguments very forcible and strong. It is the opinion of those who pretend to be judges, that he will shine in the pulpit, but as yet he is rather awkward in his appearance."

The first two winters after leaving St. Andrews were spent in Edinburgh where he took a particular interest in chemistry. His first stated preaching was as an assistant in the winter of 1801-2 in the parish of Cavers, on the banks of the Teviot. Few records remain of his work and experiences there, but the conclusion of his farewell sermon has these sentences on the satisfactions of religion: "You are in a world of care and suffering. . . . Hold fast to religion. It will console you amid the ills and perplexities of life; it will be unto you as the shadow of a great rock in a weary land; it will bless you in the evening of your days, and conduct you to the glories of an eternal world." In the autumn of 1804 he received the appointment as minister of the Parish of Kilmany, and at the same time was appointed to the Mathematical Assistantship at St. Andrews.

The traveler crossing the great bridge over the Firth of Tay into Dundee will be able to see on a clear day a sheltered and fertile valley not far from the Fifeshire coast. Into this valley Chalmers went as minister of the parish of Kilmany. It was an agricultural community and numbered about 150 families. Here Chalmers was ordained in May, 1803. At this time mathematics and not theology was his ruling passion, and his great success as a lecturer in mathematics at St. Andrews, where he was assistant professor, like all other success, brought upon him the enmity and jealousy of the professors and authorities at the University. He was summarily dismissed, and on the ground of incompetence. No quarrels are so violent as those among men of

abiliy in university circles. To clear his name from the reproach with which it had been impeached, Chalmers for a time gave lectures independently at St. Andrews to crowded classes. His enthusiasm for mathematics and for chemistry was unbounded. He gave popular demonstrations in chemistry for the benefit of his parishioners. On one occasion when he was explaining the power of bleaching liquids, one wife of Kilmany said to another: "Our minister is naething short o' a warlock; he was teaching the folk to clean claes without soap." "Aye woman," was the reply, "I wish he wad teach me to mak parritch without meal!"

During these first years of his ministry at Kilmany, Europe was in the midst of a mighty conflict with France and Napoleonism. At the very outset of his career, Clammers saw in Bonaparte the destroyer of the liberties of Europe. The dread of invasion hung over Britain and the pulpits of the land rang with martial and patriotic exhortations. But few sermons could have been more stirring than that delivered at Kilmany by Chalmers and which concluded with the following sentences: "May that day when Bonaparte ascends the throne of Britain be the last of my existence; may I be the first to ascend the scaffold he erects to extinguish the worth and spirit of the country; may my blood mingle with the blood of patriots; and may I die at the foot of that altar on which British independence is to be the victim." There was the ardent spirit of the young patriot. But when we read this let us remember that one of the noblest addresses ever made in behalf of peace and against war was the sermon preached by Chalmers upon the conclusion of peace with France. How like the fears and hopes of men in the world-war were the fears and hopes of men then, when Britain was menaced not by German invasion but by the restless ambition of Napoleon. What better description of the relief and triumph of our own great day than those words of Chalmers when Napoleon fell: "The whole of Europe is now at rest from the tempest which convulsed it—and a solemn treaty with all its adjust-

ments and all its guarantees, promises a firm perpetuity to the repose of the world. We have long fought for a happier order of things, and at length we have established it. That gigantic ambition which stalked in triumph over the oldest and firmest of our monarches, is now laid—and can never again burst forth from the confinement of its prisonhold to waken a new uproar and to send forth new troubles over the face of a desolated world."

The quiet of his retreat at Kilmany was broken by a visit to London where Chalmers heard and met many of the notable men of the day. Soon after his return he published his first book, a treatise on economics, well received by students of that science. It will by this time be apparent to all who read these lines that the ministerial duties of Chalmers were his last consideration. They were discharged perfunctorily, and it was not unnatural that his ministry had excited little note or comment. His thirst for scientific eminence and literary fame put all other work and occupation into the background. But Chalmers was on the border of a great change. "God", said the New England philosopher, "enters every man's life by a private door." He entered Chalmers' life by the door of sickness. His Christianity was light and superficial and his theology was nothing more than a proclamation of morality. This enthusiast in science and this lecturer in mathematics and chemistry and this writer of books on economics was 29 years of age, when, in the summer of 1809, he was stricken with a grave illness. For four months he never left his room and for almost a year was absent from his pulpit. He found that his ethical view of Christianity could not stand the scrutiny of the sick room and left him but a broken sword with which to ward off the blow of death. Feeling that he was soon to die, the unseen and the eternal began to displace the shadows which he had been pursuing. He resolved if spared to change his whole manner of life, and to devote all his energy and all his talent to the service of God and to train himself for eternity. At this time he began to write the

journal which must rank with the classics of devotion as a masterpiece of self-scrutiny and self-dedication, for it marks the course his troubled soul took in passing from the darkness of self-righteousness and vague morality into that light which shines for him who at length plants his feet upon the Rock of Ages. Let me quote his son-in-law and his biographer, Hanna: "Looking through the dimness we have been able only to discern a wasted invalid, lying with a volume of Lardner or Voltaire or Pascal spread out before him, rising to pace his room with weak and tottering step; wearied with the brief effort, reclining again, getting one or another of his sisters to read to him, or sending over to Galdry for Mr. Smith to wile away an evening hour by parish gossip, or by engaging in a game of cards. But there are hours of stillness and seclusion in that chamber, when the tread of the last enemy is heard at the door, and when the spirit, stirred up at the sound, revolves and revolves its eternal destinies. Into these no light can guide us; we can but wait and watch for the precious fruit they are afterwards to bear." Suffice it to say that out of that sickness Chalmers came forth with the oil of consecration upon his mighty brow. As Lord Roseberry phrased it in the address delivered in Glasgow upon the one hundredth anniversary of his settlement in that city, "An illness lifted him into a higher sphere, and he soared aloft. There he remained to the end in communion with the Divine." We find this entry in his diary for May the sixth: "Preached this Sunday, after a retirement of thirty-one weeks from all public duty, and have not felt myself the worse of it. Gracious God! reveal to me the importance and the extent of my duties, and may the glory and interest of religion be all my exertion and all my joy."

His life henceforth is an answer to that prayer, and we behold a great and commanding personality, the sole object of whose exertion and interest is the glory of religion. He who had given all his time to chemistry and mathematics and economics, now, with deep contrition for the past neg-

lect, began the systematic study of the Bible. One of his most frequent visitors was a neighbor, John Bonthron. Being admitted to easy familiarity with Chalmers, he once said to him, "I find you aye busy, sir, with one thing or another, but come when I may, I never find you at your studies for the Sabbath." "Oh, an hour or two on the Saturday evening is quite enough for that" was the minister's reply. But now all was different, and always on entering the manse, John found the minister poring over the pages of the Bible. The contrast was so great that he said to him on one occasion, "I never come in now, sir, but I find you aye at your Bible." "All too little, John, all too little" was the significant reply.

The change was soon to show itself in the Kilmany church. His sermons now burned with a zeal that had hitherto been absent. The greatness and the glory of the Atonement seized upon his soul and that enthusiasm quickly communicated itself to others. The scanty congregation was multiplied until the church could not contain them and the fame of this fiery evangelist began to spread far and wide. What the burden of his preaching was, this ancedote will describe: Two young men who had heard him preach one day met as the congregation dispersed. The one said to his friend, "Did you feel anything particularly in church today? I never felt myself to be a lost sinner till today, when I was listening to that sermon." "It is very strange," said his companion, "it was just the same with me." It was proposed that they kneel in prayer beneath the shade of a nearby tree. There they poured out their souls to God. Both dated their conversion from that day. For years they kept up the practice, kneeling together each day in that trysting place of the soul.

The change that came over the preaching of Chalmers is best described for us by Chalmers himself in one of the farewell addresses when he was leaving Kilmany: "I cannot but record the effect of an actual though undesigned experiment which I prosecuted for upwards of twelve years

among you. For the greater part of that time I could expatiate on the manners of dishonesty, on the villainy of falsehood, on the despicable arts of calumny; in a word, upon all those deformities of character which awake the natural indignation of the human heart against the pests and the disturbers of human society. It never occurred to me that all this might have been done, and yet every soul of every hearer might have remained in full alienation from God. . . . But the interesting fact is, that during the whole of that period in which I made no attempt against the natural enmity of the mind to God, I certainly did press the reformations of honour and truth and integrity among my people, but I never once heard of any such reformations having been effected amongst them. I am not sensible that all the vehemence with which I urged the virtues and the proprieties of social life had the weight of a feather on the moral habits of my parishioners. And it was not till I got impressed by the utter alienation of the heart in all its desires and affections from God; it was not till reconciliation to Him became the distinct and the prominent object of my ministerial exertions; it was not till the free offer of forgiveness through the blood of Christ was urged upon their acceptance, and the Holy Spirit given through the channel of Christ's mediation to all who ask Him was set before them as the unceasing object of their dependence and their prayers, that I ever heard of any of those subordinate reformations which I aforetime made the earnest and the zealous, but, I am afraid, at the same time, the ultimate object of my earlier ministrations. You have taught me to preach Christ is the only effective way of preaching morality in all its branches; and out of your humble cottages have I gathered a lesson which I pray God that I may be enabled to carry, with all its simplicity, into a wider theatre."

Kilmany was too small a station for such a burning and a shining light, and in November, 1814, after twelve years of service in that peaceful valley, Chalmers was called to

the ministry of the Tron Church in Glasgow. Evangelical religion was at low ebb when Chalmers appeared in the pulpit of the Tron Church, and infidelity and deism wore a thin disguise. The great doctrines of Christianity were openly scorned and repudiated by the learned and influential. The coming of Chalmers changed everything. His great intellect and his burning enthusiasm brought multitudes back to an appreciation of the truth of the Gospel, and even those whose heart remained unmoved were compelled to confess that the doctrines which Chalmers proclaimed were indeed the doctrines of the Bible and of Christianity.

One of the events of his ministry in the Tron Church was the delivery of the celebrated *Astronomical Discourses*. The purpose of these discourses was to answer the argument brought against Christianity on the ground of the vastness and variety of the worlds which lie scattered in the immeasurable fields of space. This planet was held to be too mean a stage for the sublime tragedy of redemption. On every Thursday when these sermons were delivered, a great concourse of people could be seen pouring down the street that led to the black and fortress-like church. Banks, coffee rooms, clubs and drawing rooms were forsaken, and all the interests of the world receded into the background as for two hours the great preacher led his hearers through the vastness of the universe, overwhelming them with the pettiness of this terrestrial globe and the physical insignificance of man, but only to thrill them with his glowing periods on the condescension of the Almighty Creator and Redeemer in coming to die for man, and to send them back to their daily tasks with the deep conviction that the chief interests of life are those interests which human salvation involves, and with the words of the Psalmist ringing in their ears, "Thou hast made him a little lower than the angels; Thou has crowned him with glory and honour." In 1817 these sermons were given to the press. In ten weeks 6000 copies had been sold; within a year 20,000 copies were in circulation. Scott's

Tales of a Landlord were issued at the same time and for almost a whole year the Astronomical Discourses of Chalmers kept abreast with the tales of the greatest of Scottish novelists. These sermons made Chalmers' name and fame secure throughout Britain. Even Hazlit wrote of them, "These sermons ran like wildfire throughout the country, were the darlings of the watering places, were laid on the windows of inns, and were to be met with in all the places of public resort." Perhaps in those sermons Chalmers dealt with doubts that had never suggested themselves to the majority of his hearers. After all, the great doubts rise out of the pains of personal experience and not from a survey of the order of this or other worlds.

An incident in Chalmers' Glasgow ministry was his association with the gifted but unfortunate Edward Irving, the friend of Carlyle and the lover of his young pupil, Jane Welsh. After seven years of teaching, Irving had been licensed at Kircaldy and came up to Edinburgh to pursue his studies. The long course of apprenticeship was over, the young licentiate stood ready for his task, but no door was open. Fully prepared to preach, yet nobody wanted to hear him. Ready to go into the vineyard, but no man had hired him. He was beginning to droop in spirits, as well he might have done, when he was requested to preach for Dr. Andrew Thomson in St. George's Church, Edinburgh. In the congregation, by careful arrangement, sat the great Dr. Chalmers just then launching out in the experiment of St. John's parish in Glasgow, and looking for an assistant. Irving's hopes beat high and then sank as the weeks passed and still no intimation from Chalmers. Despairing of any opening in Scotland, he resolved upon some apostolic missionary tour in Persia, going out with no connections or backing, but as the first disciples went forth to preach Christ. At Greenock he intended to take a boat that would go south to the Solway, but once on board, found it starting for the Highlands. He leaped from the deck, and in a strange caprice, boarded the first boat that he saw, one sail-

ing for Belfast. In Ireland he was forthwith arrested as a suspicious character, but was rescued from jail by the Presbyterian minister, Dr. Hanna, father of the biographer of Chalmers. In heedless gloom, he wandered about over the north of Ireland, once standing behind a pillar in St. Patrick's during high mass, and a poor woman plucking him by the coat-tails till he was forced to kneel. At length he was handed a letter from his father-in-law with an enclosure from Dr. Chalmers not one word of which he had been able to decipher. This was an invitation to become Chalmers' helper at St. John's.

This call was the dawning of the day for him. He did little preaching, and when it was announced that he was to preach, he would meet groups of the kirk folk coming away from the door, saying one to the other, "It's no himself the day." This must have been mortifying to Irving, with the consciousness of his great still slumbering parts. But his chief work was among the poor, then in great destitution and on the verge of revolt and insurrection. He carried with him a priestly air that was new for Scotland and saluted every cottage he entered with the words, "Peace be with you!" He had been there only two years when he was invited to become minister of the Scotch Chapel in Hatton Garden, London, a poor, brokendown church with a dispirited band of worshippers. He gladly accepted, and from the very first seems to have felt that he had come to his own. To Jane Welsh, whom he addresses as "my lovely pupil", he writes: "I have become all at once full of hope and activity. My intellect long unused to expand itself, is now awakening again, and truth is revealing itself to my mind. And perhaps the dreams and longings of my fair correspondent may yet be realized."

Within a year after his settlement in that obscure parish, and among that handful of people, Irving had reached the pinnacle of fame and renown. The London crowds fought for admission to his church, and orators, poets, philosophers, statesmen, soldiers, scientists, and members of the nobility

were his constant hearers. It is generally said that Mr Canning, who was responsible for the Monroe doctrine among other things, was responsible for making Irving the vogue in London. Sir James Mackintosh reported to Canning a phrase from the prayer of Irving the previous Sunday, when he prayed for some bereaved children as "thrown upon the fatherhood of God." The phrase took the ear of Canning, who declared that he must hear this man. He went the next Sunday and was captivated. In the Commons that week, some bill about the Church of England was up, and a member supporting it spake of the inevitable connection between talent and proper reward. Canning said that, on the contrary, in an obscure chapel, he had heard a poorly compensated minister of the Caledonian church preach the most eloquent sermon he had ever listened to. If Canning said it, it must be so; and with that, the great and notable began to frequent his church. Other men have had mobs hanging about their church doors, but here was a mob of the aristocrats of the British Empire.

Coleridge, with whom Irving had become intimate, and whose "moonshine phantasm" he drank in eagerly, was an occasional hearer, and this is his testimony: "Irving the Scotch preacher is certainly the greatest orator I ever heard, (N.B. I make and mean the same distinction between oratory and eloquence as between the mouth plus the windpipe and the brain plus the heart), he is however a man of great simplicity, of overflowing affections and enthusiastically in earnest." Coleridge and Canning are only striking representatives of a vast number of distinguished witnesses.

De Quincey in his *London Reminiscences* gives us his opinion of Irving, "He had a fervid nature, a most energetic will and aspirations after something greater than he could find in life." Then he bears witness to his power as a preacher and an orator. "He was unquestionably, by many, many degrees, the greatest orator of our times. Of him, indeed, more than of any man whom I have yet seen throughout my whole experience, it might be said, with

truth and with emphasis, that he was a Boanerges, a son of thunder; and, in a sense, even awful and unhappy for himself, it might be affirmed that he had a demon within himself. He was the only man of our times who realized one's idea of Paul preaching at Athens, or defending himself before Agrippa. Terrific meteor! unhappy son of fervid genius, which mastered thyself even more than the rapt audiences which at times hung upon thy lips! Were the cup of life once again presented to thy lips, wouldst thou drink again, or wouldst thou not rather turn away from it with shuddering abomination? Sleep, Boanerges! and let the memory of man settle upon thy colossal powers, without a thought of those intellectual aberrations which were more powerful for thy ruin than for the misleading of others!"

The sad story of Irving's eclipse, his plunging into the quagmire of chiliasm and his listening to the "tongues", his expulsion from the Church of Scotland, and his untimely death belongs elsewhere. Those who are interested will find a sympathetic sketch in Carlyle's *Reminiscences*. Seldom if ever have two such sons of genius stood together in the same pulpit. It is strange that even under the shadow of Dr. Chalmers the great abilities of Irving should have occasioned no comment in Glasgow. The truth is the Scotch never took to Irving and only flocked to hear him when he had been discovered elsewhere and was world-famous. He had "ower muckle gran'ner," the folk said, and his "chaotic splendours" were too much for them. The sagacious comment of Chalmers after hearing one of Irving's prophetical discourses is good advice for some of our ministers today,—"It were surely better, if instead of addressing himself to the faculty of curiosity, he dealt with the faculty of conscience." Yet Chalmers was not blind to the beauty of much that Irving said, for after speaking of his obscurity and extravagance, he adds, "but now and then gleams of exquisite beauty." Unquestionably Irving was the greater genius of the two, but they were both Sons of Thunder, Irving, however, speaking in grander and

more prophetlike tones. Carlyle's comparison of the two is worth reading: "Irving's discourses were far more opulent in ingenious thought than Chalmers', which indeed were usually the triumphant onrush of one idea with its satellites and supporters. But Irving wanted in definite head and backbone, so that on arriving you might see clearly where and how. That was mostly a defect one felt in traversing those grand forest avenues of his with their multifarious outlooks to right and left. Sermons an hour long or more. It flowed along, not as a swift flowing river, but as a broad, deep and meandering one. Sometime it left on you the impression almost of a fine noteworthy lake. Noteworthy always; nobody could mistake it for the discourse or other than an uncommon man."

Dr. Chalmers' Glasgow ministry was marked by his great experiment in Christian sociology. From the very first he had emphasized the parish idea of the ministry and considered himself the minister of the people living within the bounds of the parish where his church was located. Though he had many hearers and supporters beyond the bounds of his parish, his pastoral services were to those within the parish. He viewed with alarm the increasing poverty and degradation of the great cities and felt that the only power which could check it was the application of the Christian religion, and in the transforming power of that religion he had a magnificent faith. In 1819 he removed from the Tron Church to the new church of St. John's, built for him by the City Council and where he was to have freedom in carrying out some of his plans of parochial organization. His new parish had, by his own census, about 10,000 souls, one-third of whom were unconnected with any church. For the greater part they were weavers, laborers and factory workers. To the Christianization of this portion of Glasgow's population, Chalmers gave himself with unbounded energy and enthusiasm. The parish was divided into twenty-five districts and he appointed an elder and a deacon to each district to take the oversight of the

spiritual and temporal necessities to those under their charge. The fund for the poor raised by legal assessment was relinquished and the Session of St. John's Church was permitted to retain the church-door collections, which hitherto had been turned over to the General Session, a body composed of all the ministers and elders of the city, and administered by them according to the needs of the several parishes. Chalmers was now left to administer these collections taken in his parish for the needs of the parish. Lest it should be said by any that his scheme worked because of his personal popularity and the offerings received from the large congregations that waited upon his preaching, he set apart for the poor fund only the offering taken at the third service in the evening, when the poorest of the parish were in attendance. Even with this small sum, less than three hundred pounds, he was able to care for the indigent. The great success of his method was due to the fact of careful supervision and painstaking investigation. The public assessment system had encouraged improvidence, drunkenness and idleness, but Chalmers' agents were instructed to show no favor to those whose condition was the result of their own folly or perversity. The result was that all the poor were cared for, but the cost of it, instead of being fourteen hundred pounds, as it was under the old system, was only two hundred and eighty pounds. For a number of years after Chalmers left Glasgow, the system worked with an equal success, and was finally abandoned only because of the unfavorable attitude of the city authorities which compelled the parish of St. John's, although it had relinguished all aid from the legal assessment fund, to contribute to that fund.

Dr. Chalmers liked to refer to the "prosperous management of human nature" as one of the great enterprises of the human spirit. His experience for four years in the parish of St. John's is a noble chapter in the history of the management of human nature. Together with the care for the poor went the instruction of the ignorant. Two

schoolhouses were built and more than 700 children received instruction for a nominal fee of 2 shillings per quarter. In each district Sabbath Schools were instituted and monthly meetings of the teachers, both of the Sabbath School and the secular, were held. Dr. Chalmers generally attended these meetings, giving the whole influence of his personality to the carrying out of his favorite scheme. The vision that he had for the masses of the working people is reflected in these sentences taken from the address delivered by Dr. Chalmers at the opening of the first of the parish schools: "There will, I prophesy, if the world is to stand, there will be a great amelioration in the life of general humanity. The labouring classes are destined to attain a far more secure place of comfort and independence in the commonwealth than they have ever yet occupied, and this will come about not as the fruit of any victory gained on the arena of angry and discordant politics, but far more surely as the result of growing virtue and intelligence and worth among the labourers themselves. I trust the time is coming when humble life will be dignified both by leisure and by literature, when the work of the day will be succeeded by the reading and the improving conversations of the evening, when many a lettered sage as well as many an enlightened Christian will be met with even in the lowest walks of society, when the elements of science and philanthropy and high scholarship will so ripen throughout the general mind of the country as to exalt it prodigiously above the level of its present character and acquirements."

There was no little surprise, when, after eight years in Glasgow, Dr. Chalmers gave up his pulpit and relinguished his cherished scheme of social amelioration to accept the post of Professor of Moral Philosophy at St. Andrews. He had been working at high pressure and was probably glad of a breathing spell. His own vast popularity as a preacher had begun to wear on him. At least so we judge from the following passage in which he urges his assistant in the work at St. John's to "earn if not a proud, at least a

peaceful popularity—the popularity of the heart—the only popularity that is worth aspiring after—the popularity that is won in the bosom of families and at the side of death-beds," and then adds these significant sentences: "There is another, a high and a far sounding popularity, which is indeed a most worthless article, felt by all who have it most to be greatly more oppressive than gratifying—a popularity of stare, and pressure, and animal heat, and a whole tribe of other annoyances which it brings around the person of its unfortunate victim—a popularity which rifles home of its sweets, and by elevating man above all his fellows places him in a region of desolation, where the intimacies of human fellowship are unfelt, and where he stands a conspicuous mark for the shafts of malice, and envy, and detraction—a popularity which, with its head among storms and its feet on the treacherous quicksands, has nothing to lull the agonies of its tottering existence but the hosannahs of a drivelling generation."

St. Andrews was the first place in Scotland where the lamp of the Gospel had been lighted. If you have visited the town you have seen the prison of John Knox and the grim column of St. Regulus which stands there as a monument to primitive Christianity and against which the storms of ten centuries have beaten in vain. There Hamilton had perished in the flames, there Wishart won the martyr's crown, and there Knox had first preached the Gospel, and off its shores toiled in the French galleys. Amid memories like this Chalmers labored mightily for the Kingdom of God. He was there only a few years, but in that brief period there went out from St. Andrews some of the great missionaries of the church, Nesbit, Mackay, Ewart and Alexander Duff.

From St. Andrews, Chalmers was called to the most honorable and most important office in the gift of the Church of Scotland, the Professorship of Divinity at Edinburgh University. He was in the midst of these high tasks when the great crisis arose which ended in disruption. The

division was not one of doctrine, but of polity. There had long been growing unrest in the Church of Scotland over the attitude of the Courts towards the Church. Men who were unacceptable to the churches would be presented for the living, and when the Presbytery refused to install such a minister, the Courts ruled that the livings depended upon the Church's obedience to the judicial mandates. The crisis came in the famous Strathbogie case when seven ministers had been suspended by the Assembly for installing against the orders of the Assembly a minister for whom only one person out of a parish of three thousand had voted. The Courts ruled that these seven ministers alone constituted the true Presbytery of Strathbogie and followed this ruling with an interdict which forbade any other minister to preach the Gospel, not only in the churches and school-houses, but on any spot within the bounds of several parishes. Chalmers, M'Cheyne and Guthrie hastened to disobey the interdict. May, 1843, was a great day in the history of the Scottish Church. Four hundred ministers, renouncing their churches and their livings, withdrew from the Assembly, led by Chalmers, and walking three abreast, marched down the streets of Edinburgh to form the Assembly of the Free Church. Lord Jeffrey was sitting reading in his room when the news was brought to him that more than four hundred ministers had gone out. He flung aside the book he was reading and leaping to his feet exclaimed, "I'm proud of my country; there is not another country upon earth where such a deed could have been done." With that great deed the name of Thomas Chalmers will be forever associated, and his was the eloquent voice that rang out in Presbyteries and Assemblies, in town halls and in lonely highland glens, calling upon the people to support and maintain the new establishment.

I have already "adverted," if I may use a Chalmerian verb, to the fact that in his college days at St. Andrews, Chalmers had composed an oration, *Christian Enthusiasm,* and that it was a part of this college oration that he re-

produced when 40 years later, he stood up before 400 evangelical ministers deliberating about disruption and thrilled them with his own enthusiasm. The following is an excerpt from that speech: "Enthusiasm is a virtue rarely produced in a state of calm and unruffled repose. It flourishes in adversity. It kindles in the hour of danger, and rises to deeds of renown. The terrors of persecution only serve to awaken the energy of its purposes. It swells in the pride of integrity, and, great in the purity of its cause, it can scatter defiance amid a host of enemies. The magnanimity of the primitive Christians is beyond example in history. It could withstand the ruin of interests, the desertion of friends, the triumphant joy of enemies, the storms of popular indignation, the fury of a vindictive priesthood, the torments of martyrdom. The faith of immortality emboldened their profession of the gospel, and armed them with contempt of death."

This eminent scientist, this political economist, this ecclesiastical statesman, this superb preacher was lodged in a personality of delightful simplicity and intense humanity. He, who could in his astronomical sermons, invade the solar spaces and tell the number of the stars, could also heal the broken hearted, and the same personality which poured forth its matchless periods over the greatness of God as seen in creation and in redemption, could also kneel in a lonely cottar's hut and mingle his tears with the father and mother over the bed of a dying infant. The same man, who carried on a correspondence with Peel and the political leaders of his day with regard to social conditions, was no cloistered economist, but went himself among the poor and knew their downsitting and their uprising. He won not only the admiration but the affection of men, and when he was buried, his old beadle at St. John's in Glasgow walked all the way to Edinburgh to be present at the funeral.

He was a great traveler and lived to fulfill his ambition of ascending the tower of every cathedral in England. He thus describes a hostess at one of the houses where he

stopped: "She never asks the same thing twice of me, but she makes up for this by the exceeding multitude of these things, such as, if my tea is right, if I take cream, if I am fond of little or much cream, if I would take butter to my cake, when I take a loaf—if I take butter to my white bread—if I move from one part of the room to another, whether I would not like to sit on the sofa—after I have sat there, whether I would like to stretch out my legs upon it—after I have done that, whether I would let her wheel it nearer the fire—when I move to my bedroom, whether the fire is right, whether I would like the blinds wound up. To reply even once to her indefinite number of proposals is fatigue enough, I can assure you: nor is the fatigue at all alleviated when, instead of coming forth a second time with each she comes forth with a most vehement asseveration, accompanied by uplifted hands, that she will let me do as I like, that she will not interfere, that I shall have liberty at her house." Upon hearing from a friend that they were distressed in the like manner by their housekeeper, he writes in his journal, "Let me not think that any strange thing hath happened to us, or that any affliction hath overtaken us which is not common to our brethren in the world."

Like most ministers and most churches, Chalmers was annoyed by one of those female pests whose attentions and ministrations belong to that vague "No man's land" which lies somewhere between the comic and the tragic. This daft creature would take a seat not far from the pulpit, sometimes on the pulpit stairs, and sometimes would prevent the precentor at the close of the sermon by starting with a loud voice Dr. Chalmers' favorite tune, "Scarborough." Her affection for the doctor she firmly believed to be warmly returned. "Mrs. Chalmers, folk said, was his wife, but she kent better, and so did the doctor himsel'." Dr. Chalmers at first suffered her gladly but at length became seized with a nervous terror of her, and on one occasion, finding her ensconced in the pulpit by his side, cried out to his beadle, "John, I must be delivered conclusively

from that woman!" Alas! it is easier to wish and to order than to be delivered, for this is the kind that cometh not out save by fasting and prayer, and sometimes not even then. This woman became possessed with the hallucination that Dr. Chalmers' wife was starving him to death, and at any moment she was likely to confront the doctor on a street corner with a supply of porridge, saying, "Come noo, Doctor, do come, and get a plate of parritch: I hae fine meal the noo." A year after he had left Glasgow and was on a return visit, he burst suddenly into the house of one of his elders, taking refuge from the woman, crying, "that daft woman is in pursuit of me." Such women recall the watchword of Gideon's pursuit of the Midianites, "Faint, yet pursuing."

But there are daft men as well as daft women. One of these fellows interrupted Dr. Chalmers on a busy morning and got a hearing on the ground that he was in great religious distress. He was troubled about Melchizedek. After Dr. Chalmers had spent a half hour in trying to enlighten him and help him with his difficulty, the knave took the opportunity to ask for money. Dr. Chalmers saw the deception and with a whirlwind of anger catapulted him out of the house, saying in a terrible voice, "Not a penny! Not a penny! And to bring your hypocrisy on the shoulders of Melchizedek!"

As a pulpit preacher, Chalmers has few, if any, equals in the history of Christianity. He was not an out-of-doors orator like Whitefield or Peter the Hermit, or Wesley, nor a popular assembly preacher like Spurgeon, but as a pulpit preacher, speaking amid the order and solemnity of the House of God to an eager and expectant multitude, the records of the church may be searched in vain for one who wielded the "sublime thunders" of Chalmers. And the remarkable thing is that his was the eloquence of the manuscript. The perusal of any of those strange sermons with their long periodic sentences rolling up to a climax, sentence after sentence, like successive waves on the sea-

shore, will let the reader know that that kind of eloquence would have been absolutely impossible in extempore or memoriter preaching.

One of the events of the Kilmany ministry was a visit paid to Chalmers by Andrew Fuller, the celebrated Baptist divine. Mr. Fuller urged upon Chalmers preaching without notes. "If that man," he said to his friend, "would but throw away his papers in the pulpit, he would be the king of Scotland." Chalmers made an eager but unsuccessful attempt to carry out this advice. After several attempts he returned to his manuscript, likening himself to a full bottle which when turned upside down discharges itself slowly and with jerks and stops, while the nearly empty bottle discharges itself fluently. At that time there was a popular prejudice against the manuscript in Scotland and a friend of Chalmers expressed his surprise to a country woman of Fife that she who hated reading so much should yet be so fond of Chalmers. "Nae doubt," the woman answered, "but it's fell readin' thon!"

At the very outset of his ministry, Chalmers rid himself of one of the superstitions that hampered the ministers of his day and still more fetters the ministers of the present day, viz., the fear of using a sermon that had already been preached. Thomas Guthrie, a youthful contemporary of Chalmers, and as popular, in his way, as a preacher as Chalmers had been, relates how his parishioner, Hugh Miller, wondered how a minister could come forth Sunday after Sunday with even one good and finished discourse. He tells too of how Robert Hall, when asked the number of discourses a minister could prepare in a week, answered, "If he is a deep thinker and a great condenser, he may get up one: if he is an ordinary man, two: but if he is an ass, sir, he will produce half a dozen!" Chalmers wrote comparatively few sermons, and recommended a like practise to his students. Dean Ramsay tells of hearing his sermon on the love of God in the parish church at Haddington, and when he expressed his pleasure to Chalmers at being pres-

ent, the latter said, "I felt rather uncomfortable, for I saw a gentleman present who must have been hearing it for the fourth time." The remarkable thing was that bending over an old faded manuscript he could glow with the same enthusiasm that had marked the first delivery of the sermon. People got to know his sermons and went all the more eagerly to hear them a second, third or even a fourth time. His favorite sermon was the text from Isaiah xxvii. 3-5, "Fury is not in me: who would set the briers and thorns against me in battle? I would go through them, I would burn them together. Or let him take hold of my strength, that he may make peace with me: and he shall make peace with me." This sermon is interesting as being one in which Chalmers follows closely the divisions of the text, taking up each clause in succession, an unusual method for him. It is a textual sermon and as near to an expository sermon as he comes in any sermon I have read. He preached it twice at Kilmany, 1814 and 1815, and after an interval of about twenty years he re-employed it, remoulding it. From that time on he used it very frequently and those who heard him often became very well acquainted with the sermon. Few authors have put first the books their readers liked, and, although in delivery this sermon seems to have been very effective, the reader of the printed sermons would probably regard this one on "Fury not in God" as one of his least powerful efforts. Certainly it has almost nothing of that pictorial language and sweep of imagination which characterizes the other discourses.

In common with all great preachers the homiletical method of Chalmers was strictly topical. He never wearies you or detains you with an explanation of the contextual association of the passage he has chosen for his text, but immediately gets to his proposition and drives ahead. After you have read the first paragraph or two, you know the sermon: all that follows will be a reiteration and development of that main idea. Carlyle, in that passage where he contrasts the manner of Chalmers with that of Edward

Irving, sums it all up when he describes his sermons as "the triumphant onrush of one idea with its satellites and supporters." Even the reader of the printed sermon, with the voice silent and the flashing eye quenched, gets this impression of the triumphant and impatient onrush of one idea.

In common again with the greatest preachers, Chalmers quotes hardly at all. I know of just three of his sermons in which there are quotations from the poets. His favorite quotation, and that with which he concludes his *Institutes of Theology*, was this from Gambold, the Moravian:

> "I'm apt to think, the man
> That could surround the sum of things, and spy
> The heart of God and secrets of His empire,
> Would speak but love. With him the bright result
> Would change the hue of intermediate scenes,
> And make one thing of all theology."

He never preached without thorough preparation, describing his mind as "slow, but ardent", but he had the rare faculty of being able to compose anywhere and at any time. He was no cloistered homilete, but a Christian gladiator in the midst of great undertakings. Some of his best passages were penned while waiting for a change of horses, or before breakfast, at a wayside inn. His plan was to get in five hours of study each day, and he was very conscientious about seeing that each day had its "proportion."

Thomas Guthrie was the pioneer of the modern pictorial school of preaching. In Chalmers there is almost nothing by way of elaborated illustration from the natural world, and never have I come across anecdotes such as abound in the sermons of Guthrie. Yet in his best moods, Chalmers was highly pictorial in his language. There is a wealth of figurative language; in the printed page it is cold and wearisome, but when spoken with glowing heat we can well imagine how effective it must have been.

The altogether unusual thing in the sermon of Chalmers

was the combination of pith of intellect and the riches of imagery. The moment one sets out with him on the stream of his sermon, one feels one's self caught in a powerful current of thought, sweeping irresistibly onward; one feels that Christianity is a grand thing, the outworking of a mighty plan, and that a superior mind is describing it and proclaiming it. But as one is swept along on this current of thought, one's eyes behold rare beauties, the blue sky overhead, or drifting clouds, the little hamlets that lie along the banks, the play of sunlight or moonlight on the waters. To change my figure, the pillars of the temple of Christian faith you find in Chalmers' sermons, but also the "lily work" on the tops of the pillars. Some preachers have been mighty for the foundation work, and some experts for the "lily work," but few have combined these two gifts in their preaching as did Chalmers.

As an example of his method of illustration, take the following masterpiece from the essay on the "Abuse of Endowments," where he speaks of a few chosen professors, working quietly with a small body of superior students: "They sit upon a hill apart, and there breathe of an ethereal element, in the calm brightness of the upper region, rather than the glare and gorgeousness by which the eye of the multitude is dazzled. It is not the eclat of a bonfire for the regaling of a mob, but the ensuring, though quiet lustre of a star." Or this from the sermon on Cruelty to Animals: "The whole earth labours and is in violence because of his cruelties; and from the Amphitheatre of sentient Nature there sounds in fancy's ear the bleat of one wide and universal suffering—a dreadful homage to the power of Nature's constituted lord." Or this from the sermon on Universal Peace: "We have only to blow the trumpet of war and proclaim to man the hour of his opportunity, that his character may show itself in its essential elements—and that we may see how many in this, our moral and enlightened day, would spring forward as a jubilee of delight, and prowl like the wild men of the woods, amidst scenes of

rapacity and cruelty and violence." Or this on the power of Prayer from the sermon on the Efficacy of Prayer and the Uniformity of Nature, where he speaks of the influence of the prayer of a mother for her sailor lad at sea: "A woman's feeble cry may have overruled the elemental war: and hushed into silence this wild frenzy of the winds and waves: and evoked the gentler breezes from the cave of their slumbers: and wafted the vessel of her dearest hopes, and which held the first and fondest of her earthly treasures, to its desired haven." These excerpts are sufficient to show that when those multitudes heard Chalmers preaching, they not only heard truth, facts and their demonstration, but they saw pictures painted by a master hand.

Occasionally Chalmers took a daring journey into the realm of imagination. Perhaps the noblest example of this is the conclusion to his most widely known sermon on the Expulsive Power of a New Affection. His purpose is to sum up the thought of the sermon that the mere demonstration of the world's vanity is not sufficient to win the heart from the love of the world, but that there must be set forth another object as more worthy of its attachment. He conceives of a man standing on the verge of this pleasant world and surveying all its glories and beauties, and then looking off into the abyss of space:

"Think you that he would bid a voluntary adieu to all the brightness and all the beauty that were before him upon earth, and commit himself to the frightful solitude away from it. Would he leave its peopled dwelling places, and become a solitary wanderer through the fields of nonentity? If space offered him nothing but a wilderness, would he for it abandon the homebred scenes of life and of cheerfulness that lay so near, and exerted such a power of urgency to detain him? Would not he cling to the regions of sense, and of life, and of society?—and shrinking away from the desolation that was beyond it, would not he be glad to keep his firm footing on the territory of this world, and to take shelter under the silver canopy that was stretched over it?

"But if, during the time of his contemplation, some happy

island of the blest had floated by: and there had burst upon his senses the light of its surpassing glories, and its sounds of sweeter melody; and he clearly saw, that there, a purer beauty rested upon every field, and a more heartfelt joy spread itself among all the families; and he could discern there a peace, and a piety, and a benevolence, which put a moral gladness into every bosom, and united the whole society in one rejoicing sympathy with each other, and with the beneficent Father of them all. Could he further see, that pain and mortality were there unknown; and above all, that signals of welcome were hung out, and an avenue of communication was made for him—perceive you not, that what was before the wilderness, would become the land of invitation; and that now the world would be the wilderness? What unpeopled space could not do, can be done by space teeming with beatific scenes and beatific society. And let the existing tendencies of the heart be what they may to the scene that is near and visible around us, still if another stood revealed to the prospect of man, either through the channel of faith, or through the channel of his senses—then, without violence done to the constitution of his moral nature, may he die unto the present world, and live to the lovelier world that stands in the distance away from it."

We have spoken of the order and content of the sermons: now for the manner and method of the preacher as he stood in his pulpit. I think this can best be explained out of the mouth of three distinguished witnesses who heard him preach. Scott's biographer, Lockhart, in "Peter's Letters" thus reproduces for us the scene in the Tron Church, Glasgow, the Sabbath he was present:

"I was a good deal surprised and perplexed with the first glimpse I obtained of his countenance, for the light that streamed faintly upon it for the moment, did not reveal anything like that general outline of feature and visage for which my fancy had, by some strange working of presentiment, prepared me. By and bye, however, the light became stronger, and I was enabled to study the minutiae of his face pretty leisurely, while he leaned forward and read aloud the words of the psalm—for that is always done in Scotland, not by the clerk, but the clergyman himself. At first sight, no doubt, his face is a coarse one—but a mys-

terious kind of meaning breathes from every part of it, that such as have eyes to see, cannot be long without discovering. It is very pale, and the large half-closed eyelids have a certain drooping melancholy weight about them, which interested me very much, I understood not why. The lips, too, are singularly pensive in their mode of falling down at the sides, although there is no want of richness and vigor in their central fulness of curve. The upper lip, from the nose downwards, is separated by a very deep line, which gives a sort of leonine firmness of expression to all the lower part of the face. The cheeks are square and strong, in texture like pieces of marble, with the cheekbones very broad and prominent. The eyes themselves are light in colour, and have a strange dreamy heaviness, that conveys any idea rather than that of dulness, but which contrasts, in a wonderful manner, with the dazzling watery glare they exhibit when expanded in their sockets, and illuminated into all their flame and fervour, in some moment of high entranced enthusiasm. But the shape of the forehead is perhaps the most singular part of the whole visage; and, indeed, it presents a mixture so very singular, of forms commonly exhibited only in the widest separation, that it is no wonder I should have required some little time to comprehend the meaning of it. In the first place, it is, without exception, the most marked mathematical forehead I ever met with—being far wider across the eye-brows than either Mr. Playfair's or Mr. Leslie's—and having the eye-brows themselves lifted up at their exterior ends quite out of the usual line—a peculiarity which Spurzheim had remarked in the countenances of almost all the great mathematical or calculating geniuses—such, for example, if I rightly remember, of Sir Isaac Newton himself—Kaestener—Euler—and many others. Immediately above the extraordinary breadth of this region, which, in the heads of most mathematical persons, is surmounted by no fine points of organization whatever—immediately above this, in the forehead of Dr. Chalmers, there is an arch of Imagination, carrying out the summit boldly and roundly, in a style to which the heads of very few poets present any thing comparable—while over this again there is a grand apex of high and solemn Veneration and Love—such as might have graced the bust of Plato himself—and such as, in living men, I had never beheld equalled in any bust but the ma-

jestic head of Canova. The whole is edged with a few crisp dark locks, which stand forth boldly, and afford a fine relief to the deathlike paleness of those massive temples.

"Singular as is this conformation, I know not that anything less singular could have satisfied my imagination after hearing this man preach. You have read his Sermons, and, therefore, I need not say anything about the subject and style of the one I heard, because it was in all respects very similar to those which have been printed. But of all human compositions, there is none surely which loses so much as a sermon does, when it is made to address itself to the eye of a solitary student in his closet—and not to the thrilling ears of a mighty mingled congregation, through the very voice which nature has enriched with notes more expressive than words can ever be, of the meanings and feelings of its author. Neither, perhaps, did the world ever possess any orator, whose minutest peculiarities of gesture and voice have more power in increasing the effect of what he says—whose delivery, in other words, is the first, and the second, and the third excellence of his oratory, more truly than is that of Dr. Chalmers. And yet, were the spirit of the man less gifted than it is, there is no question these, his lesser peculiarities, would never have been numbered among his points of excellence. His voice is neither strong nor melodious. His gestures are neither easy nor graceful; but, on the contrary, extremely rude and awkward—his pronounciation is not only broadly national, but broadly provincial—distorting almost every word he utters into some barbarous novelty, which, had his hearer leisure to think of such things, might be productive of an effect at once ludicrous and offensive in a singular degree.

"But of a truth, these are things which no listener can attend to while this great preacher stands before him, armed with all the weapons of the most commanding eloquence, and swaying all around him with its imperial rule. At first, indeed, there is nothing to make one suspect what riches are in store. He commences in a low drawling key, which has not even the merit of being solemn—and advances from sentence to sentence, and from paragraph to paragraph, while you seek in vain to catch a single echo that gives promise of that which is to come. There is, on the contrary, an appearance of constraint about him, that affects and distresses you—you are afraid that his breast is weak,

and that even the slight exertion he makes may be too much for it. But then with what tenfold richness does this dim preliminary curtain make the glories of his eloquence to shine forth, when the heated spirit at length shakes from it its chill confining fetters, and bursts out elate and rejoicing in the full splendour of its disimprisoned wings!"

The delightful author of *Rab and His Friends,* Dr. John Brown, thus relates what he saw and heard and felt the first time he sat under the preaching of Chalmers:

"We remember well our first hearing Dr. Chalmers. We were in a moorland district in Tweeddale, rejoicing in the country, after nine months of the High School. We heard that the famous preacher was to be at a neighboring parish church, and off we set, a cartful of irrepressible youngsters. 'Calm was all nature as a resting wheel.' The crows, instead of making wing, were impudent and sat still; the cart-horses were standing, knowing the day, at the field-gates, gossiping and gazing, idle and happy; the moor was stretching away in the pale sunlight—vast, dim, melancholy, like a sea; everywhere were to be seen the gathering people, 'sprinklings of blithe company;' the country-side seemed moving to the centre. As we entered the kirk we saw a notorious character, a drover who had much of the brutal look of what he worked in, with the knowing eye of a man of the city, a sort of big Peter Bell,—

> 'He had a hardness in his eye,
> He had a hardness in his cheek.'

He was our terror, and we not only wondered, but were afraid when we saw him going in. The kirk was full as it could hold. How different it looks to a brisk town congregation! There was a fine leisureliness and vague stare; all the dignity and vacancy of animals; eyebrows raised and mouths open, as is the habit with those who speak little and look much, and at far-off objects. The minister came in, homely in his dress and gait, but having a great look about him, like a mountain among hills. The High School boys thought him like a 'big one of ourselves'; he looks vaguely round upon his audience, as if he saw in it one great object, not many. We shall never forget his smile, its general benignity,—how he let the light of his countenance fall on us! He read a few verses quietly; then prayed briefly, sol-

emnly, with his eyes wide open all the time, but not seeing. Then he gave out his text; we forget it, but its subject was 'Death reigns.' He stated slowly, calmly, the simple meaning of the words; what death was, and how and why it reigned; then suddenly he started and looked like a man who had seen some great sight, and was breathless to declare it; he told us how death reigned,—everywhere, at all times, in all places; how we all know it, how we would yet know more of it. The drover, who sat down in the table-seat opposite, was gazing up in a state of stupid excitement; he seemed restless, but never kept his eye from the speaker. The tide set in; everything added to its power, deep called to deep, imagery and illustration poured in; and every now and then the theme, the simple, terrible statement, was repeated in some lucid interval. After overwhelming us with proofs of the reign of Death, and transferring to us his intense urgency and emotion; and after shrieking, as if in despair, these words, 'Death is a tremendous necessity,'—he suddenly looked beyond us as if into some distant region, and cried out, 'Behold a mightier—who is this? He cometh from Edom, with dyed garments from Bozrah, glorious in his apparel, speaking in righteousness, traveling in the greatness of his strength, mighty to save.' Then, in a few plain sentences, he stated the truth as to sin entering, and death by sin, and death passing upon all. Then he took fire once more, and enforced, with redoubled energy and richness, the freeness, the simplicity, the security, the sufficiency of the great method of justification. How astonished and impressed we all were! He was at the full thunder of his power; the whole man was in an agony of earnestness. The drover was weeping like a child, the tears running down his ruddy, coarse cheeks, his face opened out and smoothed like an infant's; his whole body stirred with emotion. We all had insensibly been drawn out of our seats, and were converging towards the wonderful speaker. And when he sat down, after warning each one of us to remember who it was, and what it was, that followed death on his pale horse, and how alone we could escape—we all sunk back into our seats. How beautiful to our eyes did the thunderer look,—exhausted, but sweet and pure! How he poured out his soul before his God in giving thanks for sending the Abolisher of Death! Then, a short psalm, and all was ended.

"We went home quieter than we came; we did not recount the foals with their long legs and roguish eyes, and their sedate mothers; we did not speculate upon whose dog that was, and whether that was a crow or a man in the dim moor,—we thought of other things. That voice, that face; those great, simple, living thoughts, those floods of resistless eloquence; that piercing, shattering voice,—'that tremendous necessity.' "

My last witness is George Gilfillan, the author of *The Bards of the Bible*. He tells of hearing Chalmers preach the beautiful sermon on Rev. xxii.—Heaven a Place not a State:

"Being near-sighted, and the morning rather dim, we could not catch a distinct glimpse of his features, we saw only a dark mass of a man bustling up the pulpit stairs, as if in some dread and desperate haste. We heard next a hoarse voice, first giving out the psalm in a tone of rapid familiar energy, and after it was sung and prayer was over, announcing the text, 'He that is unjust let him be unjust still (stull, he pronounced it) he that is filthy (fulthy, he called it), let him be filthy still, and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still, and he that is holy, let him be holy still.' And then, like an eagle leaving a mountain cliff, he launched out at once on his subject, and soared on without any diminution of energy or flutter of wing for an hour and more. The discourse . . . had two or three magnificent passages, which made the audience for a season one soul—a burst, especially, we remember, in reference to the materialism of heaven—'There may be palms of triumph, I do not know—there may be floods and melody,' etc., and then he proceeded to show that heaven was more a state than a place."

Browsing recently through the pages of the *Confessions of an English Opium Eater* I came upon that passage in which De Quincey describes the preacher of his school days at Manchester as a man who was "sincere but not earnest." The distinction struck me at first as very odd. How could a preacher be sincere and yet not be earnest? De Quincey explains this by saying that this minister in his preaching rarely rose in his topics above the level of prudential ethics:

"He made a high valuation of the pulpit as an organ of civilization for cooperating with books; but it was impossible for any man starting from the low ground of themes so unimpassioned and so desultory as the benefits of industry, the danger of bad companions, the importance of setting a good example, or the value of perseverance, to pump up any persistent stream of earnestness either in himself or in his auditors." Then he goes on to tell about Richard Baxter and the famous couplet in which he describes his own preaching,—

> "I preached as never sure to preach again,
> And as a dying man to dying men."

After the change that came over his preaching at the time of his serious illness at Kilmany, when he learned to cast his anchor in the atonement, the sermons of Chalmers were marked by deep earnestness. His eloquence had the foundation of great convictions. "His absorbed and absorbing earnestness" is the thing about him that impressed one of his hearers. He was in earnest because he took the Christian revelation seriously. The "lost chord" in much of the preaching of the present day, and Chalmers' day too, for that matter, is the chord of earnestness. Whether because of our frequent addressing ourselves to them, or because of the deep interrogation raised by science concerning the whole spiritual conception of the world, the tremendous facts of the Christian revelation, while not intellectually dismissed, are not always felt. From all accounts Chalmers was able to continue to feel the overwhelming significance of those facts, and to make his congregations feel them too.

Our Saviour declared that unbelief and disobedience to the Gospel were the great tragedy. The rains descended and the floods came and the winds blew and beat upon that house and it fell, and great was the fall thereof. The soul of Chalmers was thrilled with the exceeding greatness of Christianity, the interests which it involved, the sorrow and tragedy of unbelief, and the joy in heaven over one sinner

that repents. His discourse had therefore all those elements of pathos and sorrow, tragedy and victory, which are the ground of human eloquence. You might as well take death and hate and love and shame and sin out of Hamlet and Macbeth and King Lear and expect to have anything that was moving, powerful, eloquent, left in those tragedies, as to take sin and retribution, and death and judgment, and heaven and hell out of Christian theology and still expect the preacher of Christianity to say anything that would stir you or move you.

Times and manners change as the centuries slip by. The mind of man turns from those great subjects and a recreant church neglects them for the expediencies of time, and it may seem that they have lost their power and meaning. Then God kindles the ancient fire in the soul of His messenger, and as he goes forth to speak, men see the greatness of that which they had been tempted to despise; they learn anew the difference between time and eternity, and see how beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace, that bringeth good tidings of good, that publisheth salvation: that saith unto Zion, "Thy God reigneth!"

Clarence Edward Macartney.

Philadelphia.

SCIENTIFIC BIBLICAL CRITICISM

ARTICLE II

In the April number of this REVIEW, an attempt was made to apply the laws of evidence to the attacks upon the genuineness of the Pentateuch and upon the integrity of the text of the Old Testament. In this article the same method of procedure will be employed in defending the *prima facie* claims of the books of the Old Testament along the lines of grammar, vocabulary, and history.

D. THE GRAMMAR

Passing from the text to the grammar we find that in this line of attack upon the Scriptures, the latest evidence is also against the critics.

THE ABSTRACT FORMATIONS IN *ûth, ôn* AND *ân*

In one of the standard introductions to the Old Testament[1] the assertion is made that the use of "the frequent abstract formations in *ûth, ôn* and *ân*" in the book of Ecclesiastes is among the proofs "so absolutely convincing and irrefutable" of the late date of the work, "that as Delitzsch exclaims: 'If the book of Koheleth be as old as Solomon, then there can be no history of the Hebrew language.'" Since Prof. Cornill here cites Delitzsch as his authority, let us rule Cornill out of count as giving hearsay evidence and address ourselves to what Delitzsch says.[2] He was one of the greatest Hebrew scholars of his generation, and fifty years ago his testimony on a matter concerning the history of the Hebrew language was as good as possible. But a history of the Hebrew language was in his time not possible. Gesenius, Ewald, Delitzsch, Keil, and all those brilliant scholars of the nineteenth century are as much behind the times to-day as expert witnesses, as Professor Langley in Aeronautics, or a surgeon of the Civil War in comparison

[1] Cornill, *Introduction to the Canonical Books of the O. T.*, p. 449.
[2] In his *Commentary to Ecclesiastes* (1875).

with a professor in Johns Hopkins. For since Delitzsch wrote the above, the Tel-el-Amarna Letters, the works of Hammurabi, the Hebrew of Ecclesiasticus, of the Zadokite Fragments, and of the Samaria Ostraka, the Sendschirli inscriptions, the Aramaic papyri and endorsements, and thousands of Egyptian, Babylonian, Assyrian, Phenician, Aramaic, Palmyrene, Nabatean, Hebrew, and other documents throwing light on the Old Testament and its language have been discovered. These documents prove that the old-time alleged histories of the Hebrew language were largely subjective; and that the presence of words with endings *ûth, ôn,* and *ân,* is no indication of the age in which a document was written.

Thus as to *ûth,* we have abundant evidence to show that it was common in every one of the four great Semitic families of languages except Arabic.[3]

For example, in Assyrio-Babylonian, there are three of them in the seven creation tablets,[4] six in the letters and inscriptions of Hammurabi,[5] thirteen in the Code of Hammurabi,[6] thirteen in Dennefeld's omen tablets,[7] fifteen in the Amarna letters,[8] eighteen to twenty in the inscriptions of Tiglath-Pileser I,[9] two in the incantations published by Thompson,[10] and ten in the astrological tablets of the same editor.[11] These inscriptions cover the period from 2000 B.C. to about 625 B.C.

In the pre-Christian Aramaic we have five words with this ending in the Sendschirli inscriptions from north Syria of

---

[3] Wright in his *Arabic Grammar* gives four examples of forms of words with this ending. See Vol. I, p. 111.

[4] King, *The Seven Tablets of Creation,* pp. 252, 254, 262.

[5] King, *The Letters and Inscriptions of Hammurabi,* 259-296.

[6] R. F. Harper, *The Code of Hammurabi,* 147-191.

[7] *Babylonish-Assyrische Geburts-Omina,* 220-232.

[8] Winckler, *Tel-el-Amarna Letters,* 1-34.

[9] Lotz, *Die Inschrift Tiglath-pileser's* I, pp. 204-218.

[10] *The Devils and Evil Spirits of Babylonia,* II, 165-179.

[11] *The Reports of the Magicians and Astrologers of Nineveh and Babylon,* II, 113-152.

about the year 725.[12] The Aramaic portions of Daniel and Ezra each have four and the Sachau Papyri four or five.

In the Old Testament we find from 41 to 55 forms.[13] These forms are found in every one of the twenty-four books of the Hebrew canon except Ruth and Lamentations. Unfortunately for the argument that the ending denotes lateness, nine of these words occur in Isaiah, eighteen Jeremiah, seven in Proverbs, seven in Samuel-Kings, one in Hosea and one in Amos, two in Ezekiel, two in Deuteronomy, two in H and four in JE. Of the documents that some or all critics place after the captivity, Ezra has two words ending in *ûth,* Nehemiah three, Chronicles three, Haggai one, Daniel one, Job one, Psalms five, P two, Esther one, and Ecclesiastes five or six.[14] Joel, Jonah, Malachi, Ruth, the Song of Songs, Lamentations, and the parts of Zechariah, Proverbs and Isaiah, placed by the critics in post-captivity times have no words with this ending.[15]

Proverbs xxx and xxxi, according to Dr. Driver, "doubtless of post-exilic origin,"[15a] have no words ending in *ûth.* In the documents claimed as post-exilic by the critics, the only words with this ending, not occurring in exilic or pre-exilic documents, and found in documents alleged by any one to be from the Maccabean times are ילדות (Ps. cx. 3)[16] and התחברו (Dan. xi. 23).

[12] מלכו, כברו, זכרו, אלהו, אברו.

[13] Fifty-five, if we count the forms in *ûth* from verbs whose third radical was *waw* or *yodh.*

[14] Of these words the only ones not found in the documents which the critics place before the exile are עבדות (Ezra and Nehemiah), התחברות (Dan. xi. 23), חלמות (Job vi. 6), אילות (Ps. cx. 3; Ecc. xi. 9, 10), מלאכות (Ps. lxxiii. 28, and Haggai i. 3), and שחרות, סכלות, הוללות and שפלות in Ecclessiastes.

[15] The words ending in *ûth* in Is. xl-lx occur in xli. 12, xlix. 19, l. 1, 3 and liv. 4. All of these passages are put by Duhm and Cheyne in the original work of Deutero-Isaiah (LOT, p. 245).

[15a] LOT, p. 406.

[16] Cheyne puts this psalm in Maccabean times. Christ according to Matt. xx. 44, Mark xii. 36 and Luke xx. 42 and Peter according to Acts ii. 34, ascribe it to David in terms as explicit as language can employ. Matt. xxii. 44 introduces the citation from Psalm cx. 1 by

Ecclesiasticus (180 B.C.) has four words in *ûth* not occurring in Biblical Hebrew[17] and the Zadokite Fragments (40 A.D.) have two,[18] Ecclesiastes has six words in *ûth,* of which four do not occur elsewhere in the Old Testament.[19]

It is evident, therefore, that this ending is no proof of the date of a Hebrew document, nor in fact of a document in Babylonian, Assyrian, or Aramaic. The ending simply denotes *abstract* terms. In the account which Bar Hebraeus gives of the life of Mohammed, he has but one abstract ending in the account of his active career and seven in the account of his doctrine.[20]

So in the Bible the books treating of concrete events, whether early or late, have but one or two of these words;[21] whereas those treating of more abstract ideas have more words with this ending whatever the date.[22] JE, the earliest part of the Pentateuch, according to the critics, has four words ending in *ûth,*[23] whereas P, the latest part, has only two.[24]

That Hebrew nouns ending in *n* (*nûn*), *i.e.*, the forms in

saying: How then doth David in spirit call him Lord? Mark xii. 36 says: For David himself said by the Holy Ghost. Luke xx. 42 says: David himself saith in the Book of Psalms. Lastly, in Acts ii. 34 Peter, in his great sermon on the day of Pentecost says: For David is not ascended into the heavens: but he saith himself, The Lord said unto my Lord, etc. Reader, what think ye of Christ? Whose son is he? What think ye of the Holy Ghost? Was Peter filled with Him? (Acts ii. 4.)

[17] נברות, בהלות, אבלו and תמהות.

[18] עריות and עשרות.

[19] שחרות, סכלות, הוללות and שפלות. The other two are מלכו and ילדות.

[20] See the *Chronicon Syriacum,* Paris, 1890, pp. 97-99.

[21] Josh. two, Jud. one, 1 Sa. two, 2 Sa. two, 1 K. two, 2 K. two, 1 Ch. two, 2 Ch. three, Ezra two, Neh. three, Dan. one.

[22] Thus, Prov. has seven, Is. nine, Jer. eight, Ecc. six, (Ecclus. eleven).

[23] אלמנות, כבדות, עדות and מלכות.

[24] עדות found also in JE. and ממלכו in Jos. xiii. 21, 27, 30, 31 a word found also in Hos. 1. 4, 1 Sam. xv. 28, 2 Sam. xvi. 3, and Jer. xxvi. 1. The opinion of Delitzsch was probably founded on the numerous accurrences of this ending in the version of Onkelos, where there are sixty, or sixty-one nouns with this ending (see Brederick's *Konkordanz*).

ôn and *ân*, should be considered late is even less justifiable than in the case of *ûth*. For there are about 140 of such nouns in Hebrew occurring in all ages of the literature; and they are found, also, in Babylonian, Assyrian and Arabic, as well as in New Hebrew and Aramaic. Besides in many cases, as in שלחן, the nouns cannot have been derived from the Aramaic, simply because they have been found in no Aramaic dialect of any age.[25]

THE USE OF THE HEBREW TENSES

Leaving the morphology and coming to the syntax, we find that here also the critics of the Old Testament cannot support their charges by the evidence. The charge that the *Hebrew perfect forms* of the verb employed in Ex. xv and Deut. i, show that these chapters were written after the conquest of Canaan, breaks down when we learn that Hebrew perfects are often equivalent to English future perfects, or even to an emphatic future.[25a]

Again it is charged that the frequent use of *wau conjunctive with the perfect* in Ecclesiastes is a proof that the book is one of the latest in the Old Testament. The discovery of the Hebrew of Ben Sira has broken the force of this argument; for we find that in it the *wau* conversive is used with the imperfect 120 times and 33 times with the perfect as against only 5 examples of *wau* conjunctive with the perfect. Moreover, the Zadokite Fragments have *wau* conversive with the imperfect 85 times and with the perfect 35 times, as against *wau* conjunctive 16 times with the imperfect and only 3 times with the perfect.

Again the critics have failed to explain how the use of this construction in Ecclesiastes can be due to the *time* when the work was written in view of the fact that Daniel which they put at about the same time has about 200 cases of *wau* conversive with the imperfect and 75 with the perfect, and only about 5 of *wau* conjunctive with the perfect. Again, if

---

[25] For a further discussion of these endings see p. 425f.

[25a] Called in Hebrew grammars the perfect of certainty.

the use is due to the time, why is it that it is found only in Ecclesiastes and not in the Maccabean(?) psalms and the numerous other documents which the critics assert to be late? Again, how explain its presence twice in Judges v which many critics consider to be the earliest document in the Old Testament; or that the perfect occurs with *wau* conjunctive in Num. xxiii, xxiv seven times, to two times with *wau* conversive? It will not do to attempt to invalidate this explicit testimony of Ben Sira, the Zadokite Fragments, Daniel, and the writings alleged by the critics themselves to be from definite periods by saying that it is impossible otherwise to bring some of the uses of Ecclesiastes within the period of some critic's definition of what were the limits of use in good Hebrew for the perfect with *wau* conjunctive; for the probability certainly is that whoever wrote Ecclesiastes knew more about those limits than any of our modern Teutonic, or even Jewish, professors. Shades of Jean Paul, Carlyle, and Walt Whitman! Ye could not have written in the 19th century, for no other mortals wrote like you.

THE SYNTAX OF THE NUMERALS

Whatever may be the explanation of the Priestly Document's use of the phrase "a hundred of" instead of "a hundred,"[26] it is certainly no indication of the *age* of the document nor of an authorship different from that of J, E, D, and H.

Starting out with the thesis that "statistical data besides genealogies are a conspicuous feature" in the narrative of P,[27] the critics in order to sustain their thesis violently and without any evidence ascribe nearly all of the passages containing the word for "hundred" to P, with the result that the word occurs according to their claims 49 times in P, and only 5 times in E, twice each in J and D and once in H. Of these 59 cases, one in J, three in E, one in D and one in

[26] *I.e.*, of the use of the *construct*, (מאת) instead of the *absolute* (מאה).
[27] LOT, 127.

P occur before *waw*, where the use of the construct state would be of course impossible. Ruling these out as having no bearing on the discussion, we have remaining 48 cases in P, two in E, and one each in D, H, and J. The example in H where מאת is found before מכם is accounted for by the fact that the genitival relationship would have meant "your hundred" instead of "a hundred of you." The case in J (Gen. xxvi. 12) cannot indicate the age of the document, since the same phrase occurs nowhere else in the Old Testament.[28] Of the two cases assigned to E, the one in Josh. xxiv. 32 is a citation from Gen. xxxiii. 19. This verse is one of four (Gen. xxxiii. 18, 19, 20 and xxxiv. 1) which the critics, without any support from manuscripts or versions, or elsewhere, arbitrarily divide up into six different portions. The word קשיטה which occurs here and in the citation in Josh. xxiv. 32 is found nowhere else except in Job xlii. 11. In combination with the word for hundred it occurs only in Gen. xxxiii 19 and in the citation of it in Josh. xxiv. 32. The only instance remaining outside of P is that in Deut. xxii. 19 where it speaks of "one hundred (pieces of) silver." This is paralleled exactly only in Jud. xvi. 5.[29]

Of the forty-eight cases where the word "hundred" is used in P, 22 have מאה and 26 מאת. Of the former, four may be ruled out (Ex. xxvii. 9, 18, xxxviii. 9, 11) because they are followed by the preposition ב and one (Ex. xxvii. 11) because it is followed by an accusative of specification, and one, (Num. vii. 86) because it stands at the end of the sentence. Of the remaining sixteen, thirteen stand absolutely, the term for shekels having been omitted; so that only three cases are left where the common genitival construction (with מאת) might have been used. In one of these (Num. ii. 24) we find the circumlocution for the geni-

[28] That is, followed by שערים, the phrase meaning "a hundred fold." The only analogy to this is in 2 Sa. xxiv. 3 (parallel to 2 Ch. xxi. 3) "a hundred times"; but in these passages פעמים is used.

[29] In Jud. xvii. 2 we have an example similar to that in Deut. xxii. 19 except that the definite article is used before the word for silver. In Neh. v. 11 the word מאת is used before the noun for silver accompanied by the definite article.

tive by means of the preposition ל. This leaves Gen. xvii. 17 and xxiii. 1 as the only other places in P where מאת could possibly have been used instead of מאה. In both of these cases it is used before the noun שׁנה, which is remarkable because P usually (17 times in all)[30] employs מאת before שׁנה. P also has מאת three times before כִּכַּר (talent),[31] four times before אלף (thousand),[32] twice before יום (day), and once before אדן.[33]

Outside of P, מאה before the noun is found in Josh. one time, Jud. four, J one, E two, D one, 1 Sam. two, 2 Sam. four, 1 Kgs. five, 2 Kgs. four, Is. two, Ek. ten, 1 Chr. six, 2 Chron. four, Ezra two, Es. three, *i.e.*, twenty-four times in the literature preceding the exile, twelve in Isaiah (2nd part) and Ezekiel, and fifteen in the post-exilic books.[34] מאת is used only three times in the post-exilic books.[35]

The extra-biblical evidence is as follows:

The Mesha inscription in Moabitic, which is a form of Hebrew, has the phrase, "a hundred of cattle," (מאת בקרין). The date of this inscription is the early part of the 9th century B.C. The Siloah inscription from about

[30] Gen. v. 3, 6, 18, 25, 28, xi. 10, 25, xxi. 5, xxv. 7, 17, xxxv. 28, xlvii. 9, 28, Ex. vi. 16, 18, 20 and Num. xxxiii. 39.

[31] Ex. xxxviii. 25, 27² (twice with the article). As to the use of ככר we find it as early as 2 Sam. xii. 30, 1 Kings ix. 14, 28, x. 10, 14, xvi. 24, xx. 39, 2 Kings v. 5, 22, 23², xv. 19, xviii. 14², xxiii. 33², and as late as 1 Chron. xix. 6, xx. 2, xxii. 14², xxix. 4², 7,⁴, 2 Chron. iii. 8, iv. 17, viii. 18, ix. 9, 13, xxv. 6, 9, xxvii. 5, xxxvi. 3, Ezra viii. 26², Es. iii. 9. With מאה it is used in 1 Kings ix. 14, x. 10, 2 Kings xxiii. 33, 2 Chron. xxvii. 5, xxxvi. 3.

[32] Num. ii. 9, 16, 24, 31. Before אלף we find מאה 1 Kings xx. 29, 2 Kings iii. 4², 1 Chron. v. 21, xxi. 5, xxii. 14, xxix. 7, 2 Chron. xxv. 6.

[33] Gen. vii. 24, viii. 3, Ex. xxxviii. 27.

[34] מאה is used elsewhere as follows: before רכב (2 Sam. viii. 4, I. Chron. xviii. 4), פעמים, (2 Sam. xxiv. 3, 1 Chron. xxi. 3), אמה, (1 Kings vii. 2, Ek. xl. 19, 23, 27, 47², xli. 13², 14, 15, xlii. 8), נביאים (1 Kings xviii. 4), איש (1 Kings xviii. 13, 2 Kings iv. 43 Jud. vii. 19, xx. 35), שׁנה (Isaiah lxv. 20²), כסף (Jud. xvi. 5, xvii. 2 [with article]), De. xxii. 19 צמיקים (1 Sam. xxv. 18, 2 Sam. xvi. 1), צאן (1 Kings v. 3), מרינה Es. i. 1, viii. 9, ix. 30), ערלות (1 Sa. xviii. 25, 2 Sa. iii. 14), שערים Gen. xxvi. 12 (J), and קשיטה Gen. xxxiii. 19, Jos. xxix. 32 (E).

[35] Neh. v. 11, 2 Chr. xxv. 9, Es. i. 4.

700 B.C. has the phrase "a hundred of cubit" (מאת אמה).[36] Unfortunately neither construction is found in *Ben Sira*, nor in the *Zadokite Fragments*. In the Egyptian *Pyramid Texts* the numeral preceded the noun; but in the records of about 1530 to 1050 B.C. the numeral is put before the noun in the genitival construction.[37] In the *Tel-el-Amarna Letters*, *me-at* (= מאת) occurs twice; once in 25.10 before *eru* "copper" and once in 19.39 before *lim* "thousand."[38] We thus see that the earliest Hebrew records and the Egyptian and Babylonian documents nearest to the time of the Exodus support the prevalent use of מאת as we find it in P.

But neither do the critics have support in the later Semitic documents for their theory that the use of מאת before the noun indicates lateness for the document in which it occurs. In Syriac the numeral stands in apposition either before or after that which is numbered.[39] The Biblical Aramaic and the inscriptions and papyri afford no examples affecting the question.[40] The New Hebrew follows the biblical usages.[41]

From all the above testimony it is evident that there is no basis in the use of the word for "hundred" for concluding that P may not have been written by Moses.

THE EXPRESSION: —— THE KING

The charge is made that the Hebrew of Daniel "resembles not the Hebrew of Ezekiel or even of Haggai or Zechariah but that of the age *subsequent to Nehemiah.*" One of the alleged proofs of the charge is that in Dan. i. 21 and viii. 1 the name of the king *precedes* the title. That

---

[36] See Lidzbarski, *Nordsemitische Epigraphik*, pp. 106, 114, 416, 439.

[37] Erman, *Aegypten*, 63, and *Aegyptische Grammatik*, § 142, 122-126.

[34] Winckler, *Tel-el-Amarna Letters*, pp. 48, 80.

[39] See examples in Nöldeke, *Syriac Grammar*, § 237.

[40] מאת is used three times in the *Sachau Papyrus*, but always as a noun in the sense of the Roman "century," or company of a hundred men.

[41] Siegfried u. Strack, *Neuhebräische Grammatik*, § 73.

this order is a proof of lateness in Daniel is affirmed in the words: "So often in post-exilic writings, the older Hebrew has nearly always the order (דוד) המלך."[42] The following tables will give the number of times the orders "the king ——" and "—— the king" are used in the books written before or after 550 B.C.

Before 550 B.C.	The king —	— the king	After 550 B.C.	The king —	— the king
1 Sam.	1	1	1 Chron.	4	9
2 Sam.	10	2	2 Chron.	15	9
1 Kings	29	2	Ezra	2	2
2 Kings	14	2	Neh.	0	2
Isaiah	6	0	Hag.	0	2
Jeremiah	10	2	Zech.	0	1
Ezekiel	1	0	Est.	9	0
			Dan.	0	2
Total	61	9	Total	30	27

Since 12 of the citations from Chronicles are in parallel passages in Samuel-Kings, the 30 instances of the phrase "the king ——" in the later writings may be reduced to 18; so that the proportion will be: "The king ——" 61 to 18, "—— the king" 9 to 27. The evidence therefore, that the order "—— the king" is often used in post-exilic writings and that the order "the king ——" is "nearly always used in the older Hebrew" amounts to a mathematical demonstration. But a demonstration of what? Why, of the minute historical accuracy of Daniel, Haggai, Zechariah, Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah, and of the unassailable character of the sacred scriptures. For mark you, the early writings before 550 B.C. follow the Egyptian order "the king ——,"[43] and the later writings follow the Babylonian and Persian order "—— the king."[44] In Hag. i. 1, 15, Zech. vii. 1, Ezra vii. 7, viii. 1, Neh. ii. 1 v. 14 and Dan. i. 21, viii. 1, we have exact copies of the Persian and Babylonian order.

[42] LOT, 506.

[43] See the scores of examples in my article on "The Titles of Kings in Antiquity" in this Review for October 1904 and January 1905.

[44] See the numerous examples given in the articles just referred to. For the Persian Kings *cf.* especially *Sachau Denkschrift* (Berlin 1912) and this Review for January, 1917.

Again, it is a matter of wonder that the author of the "Literature of the Old Testament" should have used this particular testimony to prove that Daniel did not resemble Haggai and Zechariah but was "subsequent to Nehemiah"; for the books of Haggai, Zechariah, Ezra and Nehemiah all use the exact phrase which is produced as evidence that Daniel is later than they. Besides, the critics have not produced a single example from the Hebrew literature which they place in the age subsequent to Nehemiah to show that the form "—— the king" was used by the Jews subsequently to Nehemiah. Neither Ben Sira nor the Zadokite Fragments have it;[45] nor does it occur in Isaiah xxiv-xxvii, Jonah, Joel, Ecclesiastes, nor in any of the psalms, nor in the book of Proverbs, nor in Job. Nor in this case can the critics resort to the subterfuge of asserting that Daniel is late because the passages in Ezra and Nehemiah in which the phrase occurs are insertions into the genuine works of Nehemiah; for unfortunately for them, the phrase in every case appears in the parts of Ezra and Nehemiah which they themselves admit to be genuine.[46]

Reader, if the most plausible, and probably the most scholarly, of all that school of modern critics that delight to assail the integrity of the scriptural narratives and to use so frequently the modest appellation, "all scholars are agreed," will make such palpable blunders in a matter as to which there is abundant evidence to show that the Scriptures are right, what dependence will you place on him when he steps beyond the bounds of knowledge into the dim regions of conjecture and fancy? If, when we can get abundant evidence, the documents of the Bible stand the test of genuine-

[45] The nearest to it is the phrase "Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon" in the Zadokite Fragments, p. 1, 6.

[46] Thus Ezra vii. 7, viii. 1 are in the so-called second section of Ezra embracing chapters vii-x as to which Dr. Driver says: "there is no reason to doubt" that it "is throughout either written by Ezra or based upon materials left by him" (LOT, 549). The phrase occurs in Neh. ii. 1, v. 14. Dr. Driver says: "Neh. i. 1-vii. 73ª is an excerpt to all appearances unaltered, from the memoirs of Nehemiah" (LOT, 550).

ness and veracity, and the charges of the critics are proven false, upon what ground of common sense or law of evidence, are we to be induced to believe that these documents are false or forged when charges absolutely unsupported by evidence are made against them?

THE INFINITIVE WITH ב AND כ

One more charge of the critics in the sphere of syntax will be considered because it covers several books and because it is reiterated in LOT.[47] It is that Daniel's and the Chronicler's use of the infinitive with the prepositions ב and כ indicates a date subsequent to Nehemiah. Two specifications are made; first, that this type of sentence is rare in the earlier books, and secondly, that the earlier books place the infinitive clause later in the sentence. Two witnesses only need to be called to answer these assertions. First, Ezekiel. He wrote between 592 and 570 B.C.[48] and his prophecies were "arranged evidently by his own hands."[49] His book is the one document of the Old Testament that the critics accept in its entirety, their theories being built largely upon it. Now, in this book there are 49 instances where ב alone is used with the infinitive in the early part of the sentence, just as in Daniel and Chronicles, let alone those where כ is used.[50] Since Ezekiel was written before 570 B.C., thirty-five years before Daniel is supposed to have written, why is the use of the phrase seven times[51] by Daniel a sign of a date subsequent to Nehemiah? The second witness we shall call is Ben Sira, who wrote about 180 B.C., just about sixteen years before the month of June 164 B.C., when the critics assume that Daniel was written. In the 62

---

[47] *E.g.* pp. 506, 538.

[48] LOT, 278.

[49] *Id.* 296.

[50] To wit, i. 17^2, 18, 19^2, 21^3, 24, 25, iii. 18, 20, 27, v. 16, x. 16^2, 17^2, xii. 15, xv. 5, xvi. 34, xviii. 24, 26, xx. 31^2, xxi. 34, xxiii. 37, xxiv. 24, xxvi. 15, 19, 27, 33, xxviii. 25, xxix. 7, xxxii. 15, xxxiii. 8, 13, 14, 18, 19, 33, xxxviii. 14, xlii. 14, xliii. 8, xliv. 19, xlvi. 10^2, xlvii. 3, 7.

[51] To wit, viii. 8, 23, x. 9, xi. 4 and xii. 7.

pages of the Hebrew as it is found in Smend's edition (57 in Strack's) we have but six sure examples of this usage, as compared with seven in the 10 pages of the Hebrew of Daniel, and forty-nine in the 85 pages of Ezekiel. That is, Ben Sira has about 10 per cent of one example per page as against 60 for Ezekiel and 70 for Daniel.[52]

E. The Vocabulary

Leaving the region of what we call grammar, and coming into the sphere of rhetoric, we find that the critics of the Old Testament are in the habit of determining the date of documents and the sources and divisions and evolutions of literary works on the basis of diction, style, ideas, and aim. To this method no objection can justly be made, provided that we put the four items together and do not divorce them as is too often done. Besides, we must place them in the proper logical order of aim, ideas, style, and diction. For it is manifest that an author's aim or purpose in writing a given document will determine for him the ideas, reasons, and illustrations, which he uses to attain his purpose. It is no less evident that his style and diction will be influenced largely by the aim and ideas. In criticizing a literary work, therefore, the aim of the writer is to be considered first of all; then, the ideas, or reasons that he gives to reach his aim; and lastly, the method, style, and diction which he uses. When the author clearly announces his purpose as Thucydides does in his *History,* or Luke in his *Gospel,* or Milton in *Paradise Lost,* we are relieved of the labor of discovering this purpose for ourselves and are left free to discuss the method, reasons, and illustrations by which he attempts to fulfil his purpose; and also, the style, the diction and phraseology, which he employs.

---

[52] These two witnesses should be sufficient to convince anyone that the charges in LOT about the infinitive and ב is false. However, if anyone is yet unconvinced, I have made a complete concordance of all the examples of the uses of the infinitive with ב and כ that are found in the Old Testament. There are more than 400 with ב and 250 with כ.

This long excursus has been deemed necessary because in the literary criticism of the Old Testament the discussion has too often become confined to one or the other of the above points, instead of considering them all together; and especially because it is frequently argued that a difference of style and diction implies a difference of authorship and date, whereas it may imply simply a difference of aim and ideas. The diction and style of some of Milton's poems and letters and of his *Christian Doctrine* are so different from those of *Paradise Lost* and the *Areopagitica*, that, if his aim is left out of consideration, we might infer a difference of authorship. Walt Whitman and Longfellow differ so much in style that we might infer a different age. In doing so, we would be following the method of the destructive literary critics of the Old Testament. For, as we shall proceed to show, they often infer a difference of authorship or age, from a difference of diction or style, without due consideration of the fact that these differences may be due to difference of aim and ideas. In confirmation of this statement, attention is called to the long list of words and phrases given in LOT[53] to show that the Pentateuch was written by many different authors and at many different times; and to the list[54] given to show that Jonah, Daniel, and Chronicles were written at a much later date than the apparent aim of the books would imply, or the ideas demand.

Before leaving generalities and coming to particulars, it may be well to make a few remarks about the aims and ideas of a literary work. *First,* as to aim, it must be kept in mind that an author may have a general aim including his whole work and a particular aim for each part of the general work; just as in an army the purpose of the whole is to defeat the enemy and the general staff makes out a plan of campaign and coördinates all the parts of the service to this end, while each branch of the service, infantry, artillery, aeroplane, engineers, and commissary, has its particu-

[53] Pp. 99-102, 131-135.
[54] LOT, 322, 506-7, 535-540.

lar staff and purpose. Thus, the main purpose of Milton's works was to maintain the sovereignty of God and the liberty of man; "to justify the ways of God to man," and to defend "the liberty to know, to utter, and to argue freely, according to conscience."

So the purpose of the Old Testament is to teach the uniqueness, sovereignty, justice and holiness of God and the holiness of his people to be attained through faith and obedience, repentance, atonement, and love; and the aim of every part of the Old Testament is to subserve the purpose of the whole. Keeping this great purpose in view, we can see how every part of every book conduces to the purpose of the whole; and how the different ideas of the prophets and historians and poets and wise men, expressed in various styles and dictions, all illumine and concenter to the attainment of the one great end.

Secondly, let it be remembered that while the purpose of every part of a work should conduce to the purpose of the whole, it is not true that the special purpose of every part should be the same as that of every other part. *Paradise Lost* has a different purpose from the *Areopagitica; The Christian Doctrine* from *The State Papers;* the sonnets on the Waldenses and on his own blindness from those on Cromwell and on those

> That bawl for freedom in their senseless mood,
> And still revolt when truth would set them free.

So, also, in the books of Scripture, the purpose of the Psalter is to afford us a book of prayers and praises;[55] but each psalm has a special purpose of its own, and that purpose is attained by an appropriate array of ideas clothed in a suitable style and verbiage. Like the gardens of Versailles, the general plan is one, but the plans of the different beds are many and the gorgeous effect of the whole is produced by the harmonious arrangement of the various flowers, the mingling and blending of the colors, the contrasts of light and shadow, the long allées, the pendant branches of the

[55] תפלים or תהלים.

trees, the fountains and statues, the palaces of man and the atmosphere and vaulted heavens and glaring sun.

Thirdly, the ideas and reasons given to attain the end in view will be as varied as the imagination of the author can suggest. This seems so obvious that it will surprise some of our readers to know that critics actually allege against the genuineness of parts of the Bible that they contain new ideas and reveal a tone different from what we find elsewhere in the author's works. Thus: "modern critics agree generally in the opinion that this prophecy [*i.e.,* Is. xxiv-xxvii] is not Isaiah's; and chiefly for the following reasons: 1. It lacks a suitable occasion in Isaiah's age"—a reason which means simply that the critics know of none. 2. "The literary treatment is in many respects unlike Isaiah's." 3. "There are features in the representation and contents of the prophecy which seem to spring out of a different (and later) vein of thought from Isaiah's"[56] So, also, Micah vi, vii are assigned to a different author from chs. i-v because they are said to have "a different tone and manner," and because, as Kuenen remarks, "the author does not carry on, or develop lines of thought contained in chs. i-v.[57] Parts of Zephaniah are doubted because they are thought to express the ideas and hopes of a later age."[58] Several passages in Hosea are held to be a later addition because they are "thought to express ideas alien to Hosea's historical or theological position."[59] Now, these and all such opinions are absolutely worthless as evidence. In fact they are not evidence at all in a legal sense; for they have in their favor no reasons resulting from investigations. For the fifty-five years of Manasseh in whose reign Ewald would place Micah vi, vii we have a record of but eighteen verses. For the life and circumstances of Isaiah, we have but a few chapters in Kings. Of Hosea's life we know only what he tells us and

---

[56] LOT, 219, 220.
[57] *Id.* 333.
[58] *Id.* 342.
[59] *Id.* 306.

of Zephaniah's we know nothing, except that he lived "in the days of Josiah the son of Ammon king of Judah."[60] And so for critics who deny even the additional information supplied by the book of Chronicles and the reliability of the headings to express opinions as to what the prophets may have thought or as to what the events and circumstances of their lives may have been, is simply absurd. It is not even as good as hearsay evidence. It is pure imaginings. The critic who puts such opinions forth as evidence is no better than a witness who would testify that an accused was guilty because of his race, or religion, or looks. It involves, also, on his part a presumptuousness, or self-conceit, which borders on megalomania, a disease from which Caesars and Kaisers do not alone suffer.

The reader will please pardon the indefiniteness of the above discussion. Witnesses we can cross-examine, documents we can investigate; but when a critic, or alleged expert, gives opinions based on opinions and not on reasons derived from experiments and investigation of objective facts, we can only have him ruled out of court, and request the judge to quash the indictment. Leaving, therefore, these aerial heights of speculation, in which one man is as much of an expert as another, or in his own estimation a little better, let us come down to the objective, obvious facts of earth and let us consider and test the testimony of the documents involved in the words and phrases contained in them.

WORDS ALLEGED TO BE LATE

We are prepared to maintain that a large part of the words that are produced as evidence of the late date of documents containing them cannot themselves be proved eo be late. For, first, no one can maintain that because a word occurs in a late document the word itself is therefore late; for in this case, if a late document was the only survival of a once numerous body of literature, every word

[60] Zeph. i. 1.

in it would be late; which is absurd. Nor, secondly, can one maintain that a document is late merely because it contains words which do not occur in earlier ones, which are known to us. Every new find of Egyptian Aramaic papyri gives us words not known before except, if at all, in documents written hundreds of years later. Nor, thirdly, is a word to be considered as evidence of the lateness of a document in which it occurs simply because it occurs again in documents known to be late, such as the Hebrew parts of the Talmud. And yet, this is frequently affirmed by the critics. Thus LOT mentions about twenty of such words to prove that Daniel and Jonah are later by centuries than the times of which they treat. In this Dr. Driver was simply following in the footsteps of the German scholars who preceded him. It may be considered a sufficient answer to such alleged proofs to affirm (what anyone with a Hebrew concordance can confirm for himself) that Daniel, Jonah, Joel, and the Psalter, and other documents of the Old Testament have no larger percentage of such words than those which they assign to an early date, and that Is. xxiv-xxvii and Psalm lxxix, which they consider to be among the latest parts of their respective books are distinguished from most of the other parts of the Old Testament by having no such words at all. Finally, it is obvious that a kind of proof that will prove almost everything to be late, and especially the parts considered late to be early, is absurd and inadmissible as evidence in a case designed to prove that some documents are later than others because they contain words of this kind. For it is certain that if all are late, then none are early—a conclusion which would overthrow the position of all critics, radical as well as conservative; and since this conclusion is desired and maintained by none, it must be dismissed as *absurd*.

In proof, however, that such words are found in every book, and in almost every part of every book, of the Old Testament we subjoin the following tables. These

tables are based on special concordances of every book and of every part of every book of the Old Testament, prepared by and now in the possession of the writer of this article. In accordance with the laws of evidence, that "witnesses must give evidence of facts," that "an expert may state general facts which are the result of scientific knowledge, and that an expert may give an account of experiments [hence, also, of investigations] performed by him for the purpose of forming his opinion,"[61] it may add force and clearness to the evidence about to be presented, if an account is first given of the way in which the facts upon which the tables are based were collected. One whole summer was spent in gathering from a Hebrew concordance all the words in the Old Testament that occur there five times or less, giving also the places where the words occur. A second summer sufficed for making from this general concordance a special concordance for each book. In the third summer, special concordances were made for J, E, D, H, and P, for each of the five books of the Psalter and for each of the psalms; for each of the parts of Proverbs, and of the alleged parts of Isaiah, Micah, Zechariah, Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah; and for such parts as Gen. xiv and the poems contained in Gen. xlix, Ex. xv, Deut. xxxii, xxxiii and Judges v. Then, each of the words of this kind was sought for in the Aramaic and in the Hebrew of the post-biblical Jewish writers. The evidence of the facts collected is manifest, and we think, conclusive. Intelligent readers scarcely need to be reminded that according to the Law of Evidence, no man, be he layman or professor,—though he excel Plato and Kant in philosophy, Bopp and Müller in philology, Blackstone and Stephens in law, Darwin and Edison in science, Homer and Milton in literature,—has the special knowledge of an expert in this particular department of science that will enable him to contradict with glib tongue and condescending superciliousness the facts here presented and the evidence derived from the facts. In all fairness, has not a defender

[61] Stephen, *The Law of Evidence*, pp. 100, 103, 112.

of the Bible the right to demand that expert evidence in its favor should be met, if it can be met, by expert evidence on the part of its assailants? And no one can be called an expert as to the matter now under discussion who has not in his possession the concordances and dictionaries that will enable him to get first hand information on the subject; and, further, who has not by his own investigations qualified himself to give the scientific, first hand testimony that is required of any person whose opinion is offered before his skill is deemed "sufficient to entitle him to be considered as an expert."[62]

A study of these percentages should convince everyone that the presence of such words in a document is no proof of its relative lateness.[63]

	Number of words occurring in in O.T. five times or less	Percentage of these words in Talmud		Number of words occurring in in O.T. five times or less	Percentage of these words in Talmud
Proverbs xxxi 1-9	0	00.0	Micah iii.	15	33.3
Zecharia iii	0	00.0	Proverbs x-xxii. 16	80	33.8
Isaiah xxiv-xxvii	0	00.0	Proverbs xxii. 17-xxiv	30	36.7
Obadiah	7	14.3	Sam.-Kings	356	37.2
Isaiah xxxvi-ix	7	14.3	Habakkuk	34	38.2
Judges-Ruth	107	15.8	Joel	28	39.3
Nahum	36	16.7	Jonah	15	40.0
Ezra i-vi	6	16.7	Hosea	65	41.5
Micah ii	11	18.2	Jehovist (J)	162	44.4
Isaiah xxxiv-v	5	20.0	Zephaniah	31	45.2
Isaiah xiii-xiv	10	22.2	Amos	50	46.0
Isaiah (1st pt.)	121	22.3	Eolhist (E)	119	48.7
Malachi	13	23.1	Proverbs xxxi. 10-31	6	50.0
Ezekiel	335	24.9	Holiness Code (H)	48	50.0
Lamentation	56	25.0	Chronicles	144	51.5
Haggai	4	25.0	Proverbs xxv-xxix	52	51.9
Ezra vii-x	8	25.0	Esther	57	52.6
Zechariah ii	16	25.0	Priest Code (P)	192	3.1
Isaiah xl-lxvi	62	25.8	Deuteronomist (D)	154	53.2
Proverbs i-ix	69	27.5	Proverbs xxx	15	53.5
Daniel	47	29.8	Song of Songs	99	54.6
Zecharia i	22	30.8	Nehemiah	48	56.3
Zecharia iii	12	30.8	Ecclesiastes	77	57.1
Micah i	22	31.8	Memoirs of Nehemiah	27	59.3
Job	**374**	**31.0**			
Jeremiah	278	32.1			
Psalms	514	33.1			

[62] Stephen, *op. cit.*, pp. 104, 105.

[63] In explanation of these tables it may be said that they are pre-

THE ALLEGED ARAMAISMS

Exception is to be taken to the way in which the critics use the presence of Aramaisms in a document as a proof of its age; and also to their habit of assuming that words are Aramaisms, without presenting any proof in favor of their assumption. Now, an Aramaism in a Hebrew document must be defined as an Aramaic word which the writer of the Hebrew document has used to denote a thing, or to express a thought, either because there was no Hebrew word that he could equally well employ, or because he was himself strongly under Aramaic influence, or because he wanted to show off his acquaintance with foreign tongues; just as recent English writers use *hinterland* in describing the part of Africa lying back of the coast, or as Mr. Rider Haggard uses *trek* and *laager* in his novels whose scene is in South Africa; or as Carlyle uses many German words and phrases in his writings and even copies the style of Jean Paul Friedrich Richter; or as the debaters in the British Parliament used to interlard their speeches, or Montaigne and the writers in the *Spectator* their essays, with Latin. With such analogies before them, it is easy to see how the commentators of the eighteenth century fell into the habit of calling every infrequent word in the Hebrew Bible, whose root and form are common in Aramaic, by the name of Aramaism. It was simply their naïve way of camouflaging their ignorance with the appearance of knowledge. If they had said merely that this word which occurs only here in the Hebrew of the Old Testament is found frequently in Aramaic, they would in most cases have been exactly right. But when they inferred that because it was frequent in Aramaic and infrequent in Hebrew it was of Aramaic origin and a loan-

---

pared with special reference to the critical analysis of the O.T. Thus the Pentateuch is arranged according to the documents, J, E, D, H and P; and the Proverbs are divided into seven portions (following LOT). The first column of the tables gives for each book or part of a book the number of words occurring five times or less in the Old Testament that are found in it; and the second column the percentage of these words that are to be found in the same sense in the Hebrew of the Talmud.

word in Hebrew, they indulged in a *non-sequitur*, as we shall now attempt to show.

The consonantal changes.—In the Semitic group of languages there are three great families, which may be designated as the Hebrew, the Arabic and the Aramaic. In these great families the radical sounds, ʾ , *ḥ, b, m, p, g, k, q, l, n* and *r* are usually written uniformly with corresponding signs, *i.e.*, Hebrew *b* corresponds to Arabic *b*, and both to Aramaic *b*, and *ḥ* (*ch*), *w*, and *y*, correspond commonly in Hebrew and Aramaic. In preformatives and sufformatives Hebrew *h* is ʾ in the others; and in sufformatives Hebrew *m* is *n*. In the other eight (or nine, counting שׂ) radical sounds, however, certain regular changes occur, and seem to differentiate the three families. These changes may be illustrated by the following table, which is based upon a collection of all the roots in the Hebrew Old Testament containing one or more of these eight radicals and upon a comparison of their roots in Arabic and Aramaic. There are 731 such roots in Hebrew which have corresponding roots in both Arabic and Aramaic. The numbers to the right show how often each correspondence is found in the roots of the Old Testament Hebrew.[64]

Hebrew	Arabic	Aramaic	Number of Roots
d	*d*	*d*	100
d	*d*	*ṭ*	1
d	*dh*	*d*	10
ṭ	*ṭ*	*ṭ*	71
ṭ	*ẓ*	*ṭ*	2
ṭ	*t*	*ṭ*	2
t	*t*	*ṭ*	42
t	*th*	*t*	5(?)
sh	*th*	*t*	18
sh	*t*	*t*	4
sh	*ś*	*sh*	83
sh	*sh*	*sh*	5 or 6(?)
sh	*ś*	*s*	1
ś	*sh*	*s*	29
ś	*s*	*s*	5

Hebrew	Arabic	Aramaic	Number of Roots
s	*sh*	*s*	5
s	*s*	*s*	45
s	*ṣ*	*s*	7
ṣ	*ṣ*	*ṣ*	36
ṣ	*ṣ*	‘	1
ṣ	*ṣ*	*z*	1
ṣ	*z*	*ṣ*	3
ṣ	*ḍ*	*ṣ*	10
ṣ	*ḍ*	‘	11
ṣ	*ṭ*	*ṭ*	1
ṣ	*ẓ*	*ṭ*	9
z	*z*	*z*	54
z	*dh*	*d*	18
‘	‘	‘	110
‘	*ġ*	‘	26
‘	*ṣ, ḍ*	‘	0[65]

64 For the Hebrew and Aramaic *s* = ס, ‘ = *y*, *ṣ* = צ, *sh* = שׁ, *ś* = שׂ. For the Arabic, the English equivalents as given in Wright's *Arabic Grammar* have been used.

These three families have obviously, according to the above table, certain laws of consonantal change resembling Grimm's law in the Indo-European languages. Thus, when a Hebrew root has the radical consonant *sh* (*š*) it is generally *ś* in Arabic; and in this case should be *sh* in Aramaic. Sometimes, however, the Hebrew *sh* corresponds to an Arabic *th*; and in this case the Aramaic is *t*. A *t* in Hebrew would be represented by a *t* in Arabic and by a *t* in Aramaic. These three series of changes are all common or regular and no proof of *borrowing* can be derived from the consonants themselves where these series exist. If, however, we have *t* in Hebrew, *th* in Arabic and *t* in Aramaic, the Hebrew word would probably be derived from the Aramaic, since the Hebrew form should according to rule have *sh*. Or, if we had *sh* in Hebrew, *t* in Arabic and *t* in Aramaic, the Arabic has probably been derived from the Aramaic.

Observing, then, the exceptions to the regular changes, we find that there are four or five roots or words in the Old Testament Hebrew that may have been derived from the Aramaic, to wit, נדר *nadar,* עתר *athar,* טלל *ṭillel* (Neh. iii. 15), ברות *beroth* (Cant. i. 17), and מדיבת *medibath* (Lev. xxvi. 26).

1. As far as נדר, "to vow", is concerned, the fact that its root and its derivative noun for "vow" are found in Isaiah twice, Proverbs three times, Judges four times, Samuel seven times, eleven times in Deuteronomy and sixty-four times elsewhere in the Old Testament Hebrew, shows that if this irregularity indicates an Aramaic origin, it indicates also that Aramaic words were taken over into Hebrew as early as the time of the composition of Proverbs, Isaiah, Deuteronomy and the sources of Judges and Samuel.

2. עתר occurs only in Proverbs and Ezekiel.

3. טלל which is found only in Neh. iii. 15 is admitted to be to all appearances an Aramaism. Since, according to the critics, it is in the Memoirs of Nehemiah, it must have been used by the author as early as the fifth century B.C.

4. ברות for the more usual ברוש may not be an Aramaism, but a peculiarity of the Hebrew dialect of North Israel, where, to quote Dr. Driver (LOT 449), "there is reason to suppose that the language spoken differed dialectically from that of Judah", and "approximated to the neighboring dialect of Phoenicia".

5. As to the מדיבת in Lev. xxvi. 16, it is the wont of the critics to assume that מדיב is the Hiphil participle of a verb דוב which occurs in Aramaic, as the equivalent of the Hebrew זוב "to flow." In our opinion, however, it is better to take it to be the Hiphil participle of דאב, "to be weak", and for the following reasons:

(1) זוב is used in Lev. xx. 24, xxii. 4, both passages as well as xxvi. 16 belonging to what the critics call the Law of Holiness. The verb and its derivatives are found also, in P thirty-four or more times, in Deuteronomy six times, in J in Ex. iii. 8, xiii. 5, in E in Ex. iii. 17, and in JE in Ex. xxxiii. 3. Why should the writers of H, or the varous *later* redactors have used two methods of spelling?

(2) זוב is used of the flowing of various issues and of milk and honey, but is never employed with *soul,* nor in any but a physical sense except perhaps in Lam. iv. 9; but even there it probably refers to the flowing of the blood of the slain.

(3) None of the Aramaic versions, except possibly the Syriac, render Lev. xxvi. 16 as if they considered the participle to come from a verb "to flow."[66]

(4) דאבון in Deut. xxviii. 65 is rendered by Onkelos

---

[65] The best discusions of the characteristics of the different Semitic families will be found in Wright's *Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages;* Zimmern, *Vergleichende Grammatik der Semitischen Sprachen;* Brockelmann, *Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen;* and Driver, in an appendix to his work *On the Tenses in Hebrew.*

[66] Onkelos has מפחת, Jonathan מסייפא, the Samaritan מרביאי, the Peshitto מריבא. In this word which is of infrequent occurrence in Syriac, it is probable that the א has been changed to י. Compare Nöldeke's *Syriac Grammar* § 33B.

and Jonathan by מפחת, Samaritan דבאות, and Syriac דויבא, showing that the Hebrew scholars who made these versions considered the Hebrew word in Deut. xxviii. 65 to have the same root as the word in Lev. xxvi. 16.

(5) דאב in Jer. xxxi. 12, 25, is rendered in the Targum by יצף "to be vexed" and a derivative in Job. xli. 14 by דאבון.

(6) The Aramaic of the Talmud confuses the two verbs דוב and דאב.[67]

(7) The א is frequently omitted in the Hebrew and Aramaic forms and manuscripts.[68]

For these reasons we feel justified in refusing to admit that the מדיבת of Lev. xxvi. 16 can be used as proof that there is an Aramaism in H. The critics are at liberty to make the most out of the presence of one good case in the memoirs of Nehemiah (Neh. iii. 15), which was written at a time when the Jews of Elephantine, Samaria, Jerusalem, Susa, and Ecbatana, all used the Aramaic as the language of business and correspondence. The wonder is that there should be only one sure instance of an Aramaism in Hebrew, to be proven by the variations of the consonants out of a total of 731 possibilities.

The importance of this conclusion is apparent when we consider that it affects all of the forty-two words which Prof. Giesebrecht[69] claims to be Aramaisms occurring in the single part of the Hexateuch called P (*i.e.*, the priestly codex), and also every one of the twenty-seven words gathered together in LOT[70] as indications of the date of the Song of Songs.

The noun formations.—But not only in the region of consonantal changes does the attempt of the critics to prove

---

[67] Dalman, *Aram.-Neu-Heb. Wörterbuch*, p. 84.

[68] Nöldeke, *Syriac Grammar*, 32, 33, 35; Gesenius, *Hebrew Grammar*, § 7 g; Siegfried, *Lehrbuch der neuheb. Sprache*, § 14; Wright, *Comparative Grammar*, pp. 44-47.

[69] ZATW. I.

[70] Page 448.

their theories as to Aramaisms utterly break down, when a scientific investigation of the alleged evidence is made; it fails as certainly in the attempt to prove them by an appeal to the evidence of the *forms* of the words. We have already said that the noun forms ending in *n*[71] are found in all of the Semitic languages at all stages of their development and that the forms ending with *ûth* are numerous in Assyrian and Hebrew as well as in Aramaic.[72] The forms in *ûth* have already been sufficiently discussed above.[73]

The Nouns in *ôn* and *ân*.—As to the forms in *n*, the following remarks may be added to what has been said.[74] Exclusive of proper names, about one hundred and forty nouns ending in *n* are found in Biblical Hebrew. Sixty-three of these are met with in the Pentateuch. Of the sixty-three, the Targum of Onkelos renders twelve by the same nouns ending in *n*, and fifty-one by other nouns, most of them not ending in *n*. Onkelos, however, contains sixty-three nouns ending in *n*. It will thus be seen that where the subject-matter is exactly the same, the Hebrew original and the Aramaic version have exactly the same number of words ending in *n*. Judging from this fact, it is left to our readers to determine, if they can, whether the ending *n* is more characteristic of Aramaic than of Hebrew.

Again, in the case of the twelve words out of the sixty-three where they agree, is it more likely that the original Hebrew borrowed from, or was influenced by the Aramaic version, or *vice versa*, especially in view of the fact that according to the critics themselves, the version was not written for from 500 to 1000 years after the original?

As might be inferred from the example of the usage of words with the ending *n* in the Pentateuch, it will be found that in the best specimens of Aramaic literature the number of nouns with this ending varies with the kind of lit-

71 Page 404.
72 Page 402.
73 Page 402f.
74 Page 404.

erature. Thus in *Joshua the Stylite,* we find that in the first four chapters, where the dedication occurs, there are nineteen words of this kind; whereas in certain chapters of the purely narrative parts, such as xix, lxiv and lxv, no word with this ending is found, and even long chapters like xxi and xxii have but one each, and xxiii and lxvi but three each. In Bar Hebraeus, also, we find but two nouns of this kind in the narrative of the crusaders' first conquest of Jerusalem, one of them a word similar to one found in the Hebrew glosses of the Tel-el-Amarna Letters.[75]

Notwithstanding these general considerations and this common use of nouns with the ending *n* in Hebrew documents, the critics are wont to argue that certain parts of the Old Testament are late because they contain nouns of this kind. The most glaring example of the argument is that the presence of a number of such words in Ecclesiastes is due to Aramaic influence, the assumptions being made that many of the words in Ecclesiastes with this ending are Aramaisms, and that the mere use of Aramaisms indicates a late date. In answer to these assumptions three statements of fact and evidence may be made.

1. In general, it may be said that the number of different words of this kind in Ecclesiastes is small compared with what we find in Aramaic documents of a like character. For in twelve chapters, or ten pages, of Ecclesiastes, there are but seventeen words all told of this class, whereas in the first four pages of *Joshua the Stylite* there are nineteen. Yet in the ten pages of *Joshua the Stylite* from 63 to 73 inclusive, there are but twelve as against thirty-four in the first ten pages, showing that the number of such words varies in Aramaic as well as in Hebrew in accordance with the subject treated of. It seems clear that the relatively large number of these words in *n* in Ecclesiastes as compared with other Old Testament books is due to the character of the subject-matter rather than to the lateness of the time of composition.

[75] *I.e.* אחרון. *Cp. aḥruna* in the letter of Biridiya to the King of Egypt (Winckler, 196, line 10).

Further, it is a noteworthy fact, not mentioned by the critics, that of the 140 words in the Old Testament ending in *n*, only 26 are found in Syriac. Of these 26, six are said in Brockelmann's *Lexicon* to have been derived by the Syrians from the Hebrew, and eight more are found in either Babylonian or Arabic, or both; thus reducing to twelve the number of words which could possibly be derived by the Hebrews from the Syriac. But—

2. Of the twelve words remaining, seven occur in Ecclesiastes. As to these, the following facts rule out the supposition that the Hebrew could have derived them from the Aramaic:

(1) Not one of them is found in any Aramaic document written before 200 A.D. The latest date given by any critic for Ecclesiastes is about 100 B.C.

(2) Since the Aramaic literature in which any of the words occur was written by Jews who had adopted Aramaic, it is more reasonable to suppose that the Jewish writers of Aramaic documents borrowed from their own literary and native language, than that early Hebrew writers borrowed from the Aramaic. At least, there is no evidence that these words existed in early Aramaic.

(3) The forms of יתרון and חסרון, have an *u* in the first syllable in Aramaic and an *i* in Hebrew.

(4) שלטון, it is true, is found only in Ecclesiastes viii. 4, 8; but its root occurs in Babylonian as well as in Hebrew and Arabic, and the form occurs in Arabic as well as Syriac.

(5) קנין is found in Onkelos and Syriac; but in Hebrew it occurs in Prov. iv. 7 in a passage which the critics put among the earliest parts of the Old Testament. Besides, to call it late in the Hebrew language, we would have to prove that Gen. xxxi. 18, xxxiv. 23, xxxvi. 6, Lev. xxii. 11, Jos. xiv. 4 and Ezek. xxxviii. 12, 13, where it occurs also, are late.

(6) רעיון is found only in Eccl. i. 17, ii. 22, iv. 16,

but it is singular that, if it meant the same here as in Aramaic, the Syriac version should render it by צבין in ii. 22 and by טירפא in i. 17 and iv. 16 and the Aramaic Targum in all three cases by תבירות.

The corresponding word in Syriac is rendered by Brockelmann by *cogitatio, fictio, consilium* and *voluntas;* in Dalman by *Gesinnung, Gedanke.* Must the writer of Ecclesiastes have borrowed the Aramaic form and have given it a different meaning? Why not rather suppose that he found the word already in Hebrew, formed regularly from the good old Hebrew root רעה, as פדיון from פדה and גאיון from גאה?

(7) Finally כשרון is the worst specimen of evidence of all. To be sure, it happens that in the Hebrew of the Old Testament it is used in Ecclesiastes alone; but how it can be said to have been derived by the writer from the Aramaic passes belief when we observe that the word has not been found in any Aramaic document of any dialect or time.

3. Even if it could be proven that certain words in a Hebrew document had been derived from the Aramaic, it would not determine the date of the Hebrew document; because the latest evidence from the extra-biblical inscriptions, as well as the Old Testament itself, goes to show that the Hebrews and Arameans were closely associated from a time long precedent to that at which the critics claim that the oldest documents of the Old Testament were written.[76]

THE MEANINGS OF NOUNS

Lastly, when we leave the region of sounds and forms and enter that of sense and meaning, we find that here also the critics make assertions with regard to the derivation and borrowing of words which are demonstrably contrary to the facts. In cases such as טלל (*ṭillel,* Neh. iii. 15), it is easy to show the probability that the word is an Aramaism, because the proper letter for the first radical should

[76] Thus the *Aḫlamu,* a tribe of Arameans are mentioned in one of the Amarna Letters (Winckler, 291, line 6, 8).

have been *ṣ*, not *ṭ*, if the word had the probable original Hebrew form of writing and sound. In cases such as התחברות (Dan. xi. 23), it is easy to suppose an Aramaism, because the form is common in Aramaic and is met with but once besides in the Old Testament Hebrew. But when we come to words which have no indication (*indicia*) either in sound or form that they are of Aramaic origin, we often find the critics simply asserting as a fact that a word is an Aramaism without producing any proofs whatever to support the assertion.

Thus DeWette-Schrader[77] speak of פשר, בטל, טנף and כתל as Aramaic, and a proof of the late date of Ecclesiastes and of the Song of Songs. They give no proof except the fact that the words are found in Aramaic. The evidence from this fact is nullified by the discovery that all four words are found in Babylonian, and all but the last one, in Arabic with exactly the same sound, form, and meaning which is characteristic of the Hebrew.

Again, Dr. Driver in LOT mentions among the words in Ecclesiastes and the Song of Songs "having usually affinitives with the Aramaic,"[78] אמן, שלט, תקן, שׁ, פשר, יצא, בטל, שלהבת, שׁשׁ. Every one of these words is found with appropriate sound, form and meaning, in the Babylonian language and in documents long antedating the time of the captivity. In fact, אמן (master-workman) and שלהבת are so distinctively Babylonian in form and sense that there can be no doubt that Aramaic as well as Hebrew derived them from the Babylonian.

We leave it to our readers to decide whether it is more probable that the Hebrews derived these, and all such, words from the Babylonian (if indeed most of them are not primitive Semitic) documents, which at least antedated the Hebrew documents, rather than from the Aramaic whose earliest use of the words so far as shown in writing, is in general from 300 to 1000 years later than the time of the com-

[77] *Einleitung*, pp. 543, 561.

[78] *Op. cit.*, pp. 440, 474.

pilation of the Hebrew, even if with the critics we put Ecclesiastes as late as 100 B.C.

THE USE OF SYNONYMS

We object to the assumption that the prevalent use of one synonym in one document and of another synonym in a second document is proof of difference of age or authorship. A fine discrimination in the use of synonymous expressions is a proof rather of the superior rhetorical ability of one author than of an indiscriminate use of words by many authors. Yet the critics indulge themselves in elaborate collections of synonymous terms which they put forth as indisputable proof of difference of author and date.

Thus, פדה, "to redeem", is said to be used by D in the same sense as גאל by P. A closer study reveals the fact that in Babylonian, Arabic, and Aramaic, as well as in Hebrew, the first of these verbs is used primarily and predominantly for the redemption from captivity; whereas גאל is a verb found only in Hebrew and used specifically to describe certain duties of the next of kin, such as vengeance for blood, marrying the widow of a deceased kinsman, and others, including also the redemption from captivity. In some passages of the Pentatench, as well as of the prophets, it is difficult for *us* to see why one should be used rather than the other; but generally it may be said that the next of kin (*gô'ēl*) performs his duty toward his captive kinsman (*gā'ûl*) by buying him back (פדה ,) *i.e.,* paying the ransom money. Either verb might rightly be used, therefore, in speaking of the redemption; for the redeemer only truly *ga-'als* when he *pādās,* his captive kinsman, and when he does one duty he does the other also. Any author of any age might have used either verb to denote this act of redeeming on the part of a kinsman, and there is no passage in the Pentateuch where either verb is used which could not as well have been written by the same author as all the other passages containing either.

DISTINCTIONS IN USAGE

We object to a word being considered as an evidence of age when no other word in the language could have expressed the exact meaning as well as the one employed. Thus גיל in Dan. i. 10, is said to indicate a date in the second century B.C. rather than the sixth. The only reason for this given in LOT[79] is that in the use of this word the Hebrew of Daniel resembles the Hebrew "of the age *subsequent to Nehemiah*," since it is used "also in Samaritan and Talmudic." We have already shown[80] that such resemblances for *hapax legomena* are found in every book of the Old Testament and not specifically in Daniel. It might be asked, also, why if it characterizes the age subsequent to Nehemiah, it is not found in Ecclesiasticus or the Zadokite Fragments. Or, if we press the argument, why then does it not prove that Daniel was written after the Zadokite Fragments, *i.e.*, after 40 A.D.? Of course, the critics will say that the writers of these books had no occasion to use the word, since they do not refer to any such band, or company of men as Daniel and his three companions. And they are right; but the same is true of all the writers of the other Old Testament books, and Daniel shows his linguistic ability in that to express a new idea, or a conception different from that employed by others, he has made use of a different word. For, we would like to ask the critics, what word is there in Hebrew that would so well convey the exact thought represented by *gîl?* The words for generation[81] would hardly suit, nor would the ordinary words for band or company.[82] For the author means to say just what he does say, that Daniel and his companions were brought up, or reared, with other youths of about

---

[79] Page 506, 10.

[80] Page 417f.

[81] תולדה and דור.

[82] חבל in 1 Sa. x. 5, 10, used of the company of prophets and in Ps. cxix. 61 of the wicked; or חבר as used in Hos. vi. 9 of the priests, are the best possible words. But these could not be translated by *age*, in such phrases as "about your age."

the same age. Of course they were of the same generation and perhaps of the same race and company and station in society, but the particular statement made in Dan. i. 10 is that they were of about the same number of years of age. How else could the critics have said it better and more clearly? And how do we know that Moses, or David, or Isaiah, or Jeremiah, would not have used the same word, if they had wanted to express the same idea? Let the critics tell us how *they* would have done it, if they had been writing in the sixth century B.C. Let them cease to cite the traditional anthority (*sic!*) of DeWitte-Schrader and other *German* scholars and think out some way of bettering this "rotten" (*verderbte*) Hebrew.[83] As an interested onlooker, we expect to see them confounded in all their attempts to beat Daniel at writing Hebrew. In fact, with all his difficult passages, we think him fine—much better in fact than anything in the Hebrew line of literature that either his German or English detractors can themselves produce.

OTHER PECULIARITIES OF STYLE OR DICTION

We object to considering a word or phrase recurrent in one document as being in itself a proof of a particular age. Kipling's "that is another story" might have been written any time in the last five hundred years. So "I am Jehovah" might have been written at any time from Abraham to Christ.

Nor is the fact that certain words occur in one document and certain other words in another to be taken as constituting proof of different authors for the two documents. Milton uses scores of words in his *Areopagitica* which are never found in any of his poetical works. He employs hundreds of words and phrases in some of his works that are not found in others of his works.[84] Why may Moses and Isa-

[83] *Der verderbte Charakter des Idiomes in den hebraisch concipirten Abschnitten* is cited by De Wette-Schrader (*Einleitung*, p. 499) in favor of the late date of Daniel.

[84] Thus on pages 94-97 of *The Areopagitica* (Bohn's edition of the

iah not have done the same? The fact of the variations of words and idioms is one thing, the reasons for the variations are another thing. That certain words for "create" and "make" are used in Gen. i and certain others in Gen. ii is a fact; but if this proves different authors, how about the thirty-two words which are found in the Koran to express the same idea? Are we to conjure up a dozen or more authors of the Koran to account for the variations in the vocabulary? We promise as Christians to nurture or train our children; but we speak of rearing, raising, educating, teaching, or bringing them up. In some churches, they "take up a collection"; in others, they "make an offering." Differences of word and idiom are not so much indications of difference in age and author as they are of difference in subject-matter, fecundity of conception, and fertility of expression. One great writer will use a larger vocabulary and more idioms than twenty men with small knowledge and less language.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, we claim that the assaults upon the integrity and trustworthiness of the Old Testament along the line of language have utterly failed. The critics have not succeeded in a single line of attack in showing that the diction and style of any part of the Old Testament are not in harmony with the ideas and aims of writers who lived at, or near, the time when the events occurred that are recorded in the various documents. In every case, it seems clear that the language suits the age at which the *prima facie* evidence of the document indicates that it was written. We boldly challenge these Goliaths of ex-cathedra theories to come down into the field of ordinary concordances, dictionaries,

Prose Works of Milton, Vol. II) he uses 73 words not found at all in his poetical works. There are 584 *hapax legomena* in Milton's poetical works beginning with the letter *a* alone. See the *Lexicon to the English Poetical Works of John Milton*, by Laura E. Lockwood, Ph.D., a work much to be commended for study to those who would engage in the Higher Criticism of the Old Testament.

and literature, and fight a fight to the finish on the level ground of the facts and the evidence.

F. The History

Finally, let us review the framework of Old Testament history as a whole and see how it stands the tests which modern scientific research has brought to bear upon it. Can a man of scientific attainments still place any reliance upon the chronological, geographical and other historical statements of the books of the Old Testament canon? Or, has the light from Egypt and Babylon dispelled as a baseless fabric of a vision of the night that which was formerly considered to be a real structure of historic fact?

THE CHRONOLOGY

Let us look at the chronology of the Bible, beginning with the time of Abraham.

1. In the four great systems of biblical chronology prepared from the biblical statements alone, before anything definite was known in the fields of Egyptian and Babylonian archaeology, Hales puts the time of Abram's leaving Haran at 2078 B.C., Jackson at 2023, Petavius at 1961 and Ussher at 1921. Since Gen. xiv places Abraham in the time of Hammurabi, it is fair to ask when the Assyriologists date the reign of the latter. Jeremias puts him at about 2000 B.C.,[85] Clay at about 2100 B.C.[86] It will thus be seen that the date of Abraham as deduced from the facts provided by the biblical text alone has been confirmed in a wonderful way by the evidence derived from Babylonian sources.

2. The relative date of Shishak, king of Egypt, corresponds to that of Rehoboam and is certainly to be placed somewhere in the tenth century B.C.[86a]

3. The relative dates of the kings of Israel and Judah be-

[85] *The Old Testament in the Light of the Ancient East,* I. 322.
[86] *Light on the Old Testament from Babylon,* 130.
[86a] See Jeremias *op. cit.* II, 204 f.

tween the division of the kingdom and the fall of Samaria, as given in the Bible correspond in general with what we find on the Assyrian monuments.

4. The relative dates of the kings of Assyria and Egypt as given on the monuments of their respective countries correspond with what we find in the Old Testament books.

5. The relative dates of the Babylonian kings Nebuchadnezzar, Evil-merodach and Belshazzar agree in the biblical and monumental accounts. The order is correct in whatever sense Belshazzar may have been king.

6. The relative dates of the Cyrus of Ezra, the Darius of Haggai and Zechariah, and the Xerxes and Artaxerxes of Ezra are certainly correct; notwithstanding the difficulties in explaining the passage in Ezra iv.

It is thus apparent that the general scheme of chronology which underlies the history recorded in the Old Testament is abundantly justified by the assured results of modern research. As to the apparently conflicting statements of the present Hebrew text, it must be remembered that many of them are doubtless occasioned by the inevitable corruptions in the text, arising from the practical impossibility of transcribing numerical data with accuracy. No one knows how numbers were denoted in the original Hebrew documents. It is known that the Egyptians, Babylonians, Phenicians, Arameans, Nabateans and Palmyrenes, denoted numbers by a system of notation signs. The earliest example of the use of a letter of the alphabet in a Semitic document to denote a number is in the Egypto-Aramaic inscriptions where *b* seems to be used for *two* and *ṭ* for *nine*.[87] A double system of numerical signs and letters seems to have existed among the Syrians till the ninth century A.D.[88] Sometimes the signs were given and the number written also in full as in the Sendschirli inscriptions.[89] In the Mesha and Siloah

---

[87] Sachau, *Aramaische Papyrus u. Ostraka*, p. 276, and Sayce-Cowley *in loco*.

[88] Sachau, *id.*

[89] Lidzbarski, *Nordsemitische Epigraphik*, p. 198.

inscriptions the numbers are written in full.[90] In the Sachau papyri they are commonly denoted by signs.

A comparison of the Aramaic recension of the Behistun inscription with the Babylonian shows numerous variations in the numerical statements. Since these variations can hardly have been intentional, they show how easy it was to originate variations in manuscripts when there was no special purpose in being accurate. It made little difference to anyone whether the army of Darius killed or took alive a few more or less in a given battle. And certainly, these variations afford no proof of late date or of lack of genuineness or authenticity on the part of the various recensions of Darius' great inscription.

So, also, with the variations in the texts and manuscripts of the Old Testament, we must not exaggerate the importance of the difference in numerical statements, as if such difference argued in general against the veracity or geniuneness of the original documents. In view of the numerous variations in the contemporaneous, or almost contemporaneous, recensions of the Behistun inscription, we should rather be astonished that the numerical statements of the Old Testament have been handed down with such marvelous comparative accuracy, as that we can reconstruct from the chronological data a framework of Chronology which harmonizes so closely with that revealed by the monuments.

THE GEOGRAPHY

The geographical statements of the Old Testament are also marvelously in harmony with the evidence presented by the documents of Egypt and Babylon.

1. Thus, the names of nations and cities mentioned in the history of Abraham are in general such as are known from the inscriptions to have been existent at the time of Hammurabi,[91] or such as may have existed in his time,[92]

---

[90] *Id.*

[91] Such as Egypt, Elam, Larsa, Babylon and Ur.

[92] Such as Harran, Damaskus, and Beer-sheba.

or whose existence in his time cannot be denied on the ground of any evidence we possess,[93] or such as may well have been substituted for older names in order to make the narration intelligible to the readers of later times.[94] This last alternative, which affords the only real or supposed difficulty with regard to the possibility of the historical character of the narrative, would be obviated if we suppose that the account of Abraham's life was originally written in cuneiform; because in that system of writing the signs might be read in different ways. For example, the name of the city of Babylon was written in Sumerian *Ka-dingir-ra-ki* or *E-ki,* or *Din-tir-ki,* or it was written in Babylonian as *maḫazu Ba-bi-li.* In all four cases the Babylonian scribes of the time of Nebuchadnezzar and Cyrus must have pronounced the name as *Babili,* though an ignorant reader might have spelled out the three first groups of signs as *Ka-dingir-ra-ki* or *E-ki* or *Din-tir-ki* respectively, these being doubtless the earlier designations of the place in Sumerian, before the Semitic conquerors appeared on the scene. So Laish may have been written with the signs *la* and *ish* in cuneiform and might be read as Laish, or after the conquest by the Danites as Dan. As for *Pelishtim* (Philistines), we may compare the Sumerian *nim-ma-ki,* the equivalent in the Babylonian recension of the Behistun inscription of the Persian *uvaga* and of the Susian *haltamti* (or *hutamti*) and of the more usual Babylonian *E-lam-mat.*[95] Weissbach correctly transliterates the Sumerian signs *nim-ma* by the Babylonian word *elamtu.* So the signs rendered by *Pelishtim* in our Hebrew Bibles may originally have denoted another name. That is, the sign for the land or city often remained the same, but the denotation of the signs changed. The examples of this in the cuneiform documents are so numerous that, if it could be proven that the names Dan and Pelishtim did not exist in the time of Abraham, we

[93] Such as Hebron.

[94] Such as Dan and Philistia.

[95] See Weissbach, *Die Keilinschriften der Achaemeniden,* p. 143.

would be amply justified in supposing that in the documents written in that time they were denoted by signs that could afterwards be properly read by the Hebrews in two different ways.

2. That the names of cities and nations mentioned in Gen. x suit the time of Moses better than any other time was fully discussed in an article of the present writer in the *Presbyterian and Reformed Review* for 1884. If we add the fact of the probable double reading of cuneiform signs to what was then written, the conclusions of that article will be corroborated and no reasonable doubt can longer be entertained that the genealogies of Gen. x harmonize with the state of geographical science in the time of Rameses II. This well known method of double reading might explain also such difficult words as *Casluhim* and *Naphtuhim*—words that have hitherto baffled the interpreters of all schools at whatever time they place the date of the composition of Gen. x.

3. The discovery of Pithom and Rameses has established forever the firm foundation of the account of the Exodus.[96]

4. The appropriate manner, both as to time and place, with which the proper names of cities and countries are used in the Old Testament defies all hostile criticism directed against the genuineness of the narratives. The marvelous way in which such countries, nations, and cities as Elam, the Hittites, the old Babylonians, the Assyrians, the Egyptians and Ethiopians, the Moabites, and the Edomites; Tyre, Sidon, Damascus, Hamath, Separad, and scores of other names of places, are brought into the biblical narrative, each in its proper place and time, and generally with the very spelling as accurate as could be expected, is beyond comparison in any ancient document. In view of the fact that the biblical records have stood the test of extra-biblical evidence in scores of cases where its testimony is clear and indisputable, it is inadmissible to claim that the biblical documents are wrong, either when there is no evidence on the

---

[96] See Naville, *The Store-Cities of the Exodus.*

monuments,[97] or whenever we with our limited knowledge of the facts and circumstances cannot explain satisfactorily the location and collocation of the name.[98]

5. Another fact that must always be kept in mind in discussing the Old Testament is this: It was from the beginning according to its own testimony meant to be a book for the people and not for antiquarians and scholars merely[99] Hence, we can well believe that as the designation of certain places changed, the text of the Bible was often changed accordingly. This would account for such possible changes as *Dan* and *Pelishtim;* just as we might and do speak of Constantinople as having been from the time of the glory of Greece the busy center of commercial activity and of New York Bay as having been entered by Henry Hudson,[100] or of Columbus or Cabot as having discovered America (a name probably not given to the continent till 1507).[101] That we are not without warrant for this supposition is shown by the following facts:

(1) The bi-lingual Babylonian inscriptions are full of these two-fold designations of the same place or country.

(2) The triple-inscription of Behistun and the Aramaic translation of the same often give us four different names for the same country.[102]

(3) The Elephantine of the Greeks was *Yeb* (יב) in Egyptian, and *Syene* (סון) in Aramaic, though we find both of the last two names together in the *Sachau Papyrus* I, 6, 7.

---

97 As in the case of the Hivites, Girgashites, Magog, &c.

98 As in the case of Tiras, Ashkenaz, Sabtah, and a few other names in Gen x.

99 The law was to be read to the people (Deut. xxxi. 11) and according to Neh. viii. 8 it was explained (מפרש) to them.

100 Scribner's *History of the United States,* I, p. xxx.

101 *Id.* I, 127 f.

102 Thus the Persian gives Armenia as *Armina,* the Susian as *Harminuya,* the Babylonian as *Uraštu* and the Aramaic as אררט. The name for Babylon is given as *Babirush* in the Persian, *Ba-pi-li* in the Susian, and in the Babylonian is written in two different ways, while on other inscriptions it is written in at least four additional ways.

(4) In the Old Testament itself two names are sometimes used for the same city or country.[103]

(5) The Jewish translators of the Old Testament did not hesitate to render the proper names of places by terms which conveyed the proper location to the people for whose benefit the translation was made. Thus, the authors of the Greek Septuagint render Philistines by *Allophuloi;* Misraim and Ham by *Ægyptos.* The Targum of Onkelos gives different terms to more than twenty names of places, besides giving translations of the names of more than twenty others.[104] The Samaritan Targum has about one hundred and twenty proper names, mostly names of places and nations, that are given differently from what we find them in the Hebrew Massoritic text.[105] The Peshitto translation, also, used all of these liberties with the proper names.[106]

From these analogies we are justified in concluding that the mere presence in documents of the Old Testament of certain geographical terms of later origin than the rest of the documents is not conclusive proof that the mass of the documents is as late as the terms so used. It may be simply an evidence of editing for the sake of making the documents intelligible to the persons for whom they were designed.[107]

THE HISTORICAL DATA

As to the historic character of the Old Testament records

---

[103] Thus, מצרים and חם (for Egypt), Hebron and Kirjath-Arba, Salem and Jerusalem.

[104] See Brederik's *Konkordanz zum Targum Onkelos.*

[105] So, according to the concordance in my possession; some of these names are translations from Hebrew into Aramaic; some are the Greek equivalents of the Hebrew which have been taken over into the Aramaic.

[106] This is evident in a comparison of the proper names of Gen. x and xxi. Here we find Cappadocia for Caphtor, Sepharvaim for Sippar, Ain d' ebrroye for 'yye ha'barim, Rametha for Pisgah.

[107] A good example of such editing is to be found in certain changes made in the King James' version in the Tercentenary Edition of the Oxford Press, where, for example, the word "prevent" of the 1611 editions has been changed to "anticipate," "go before," &c.

in general there are no reasonable grounds for doubting it. For,

1. The language in which the different documents are written corresponds with the claim of the documents as to the time and place in which they were written. The first chapters of Genesis are fullest of words derived from the Babylonian, as would be expected in records derived from Ur of the Chaldees. The records concerning the patriarchs who are said to have lived in Egypt are the ones containing the most words of Egyptian origin. The Assyrian and Babylonian words occurring in the documents from the eighth century downwards are mostly governmental terms and are such as would naturally be borrowed from the dominating races of the time. The Indo-European terms, whether Indian, Hittite, Medo-Persian, or Greek, appear in documents which were written in the times from Solomon onward, when the commercial and military relations of the Hebrews with the peoples speaking the languages from which the terms are borrowed would lead us to expect the influx of the new and foreign words to express the new ideas which they connote.

As to the Aramaic loan words, not one can be proven to be present in the Pentateuch, except in Gen. xxxi. 47, where the Hebrew *Gal'eed* (Gilead) is stated to have been called by Laban *Yegar-sa'dutha,* of which compound the second word is certainly Aramaic. The existence of tribes speaking Aramaic can be proven from the monuments as far back as the Tel-el-Amarna letters.[108]

2. As we have seen above,[109] the names, the order, and the time of reigning of the different kings of the countries mentioned in the Old Testament harmonizes with what we find in the documents of Egypt, Babylon, Assyria, and other countries.[110] A harmony is found, also, in the statements made as to the relative power of these kings and the extent of their dominions.

[108] See Kraeling, *Aram and Israel.*

[109] Page 224f.

[110] See for Damaskus, the article by Professor John D. Davis in the April number of this Review.

3. We have also shown in the last article and in the preceding part of this that the language, grammar and literary forms are suitable to the respective ages in which the documents claim to have been written.

4. The civil, criminal and constitutional laws also, both in their general character and in their literary forms, are in agreement with the times and circumstances when they are said to have been enunciated, or in use.[111] As to the ceremonial and ethical laws of the Old Testament, they are distinguished from those of all ancient peoples, especially by the fact that they are monotheistic and unicentral. That the ceremonial laws cannot have been derived from the other Semites is shown by the almost absolutely different vocabulary employed to express the acts and forms of religious service.[112] The vocabulary corroborates the statements of the records by showing that the Hebrew religion was of unique origin and of internal development.

5. That the Hebrew records which the critics assign to the post-Nehemiah period were written long before (as they purport to have been) is shown by the fact that the meanings of many of these terms were unknown when the earliest translations were made. Even at the time when the Septuagint was made, many meanings of Hebrew roots seem to have been unknown to them.[113] This is shown by the frequent transliterations found in that version.[114] It seems in-

[111] This statement is based on comparisons derived from the Code of Hammurabi and the laws of the Egyptians as gathered together in Révilloux's *Lois et Droits des Egyptiens.*

[112] See the author's articles on "Babylon and the Bible" in the *Pres. and Ref. Review* for 1902, and in *The Bible Student* for 1904. The dissimilarity in religious vocabulary which characterizes the Hebrew as compared with the Babylonian is apparent, also, as between the Hebrew on the one hand and the Phenician and various Aramaic dialects on the other.

[113] See my article on "Lost Meanings of Hebrew Roots," in *Pres. and Ref. Review*, for 1892.

[114] That some of the headings of the Psalms are not rendered in the LXX would indicate that the songs, instruments, times or circumstances to which they refer had passed out of the memory and tradition of the Jews. If the headings had been inserted after the Greek

explicable, also that the different translators of the Pentateuch should have varied so much as they do in the rendition of many of the terms to denote animals, articles of clothing, drugs, implements, &c., if these parts had been written in post-captivity times, when Aramaic was spoken by many of the Jews and understood by all the educated among them.[115]

6. Many undesigned coincidences support the historicity of the Old Testament. One of the most remarkable of these is the mention of the horse first in the history of Joseph, coincident with the appearance of the animal in the history of Western Asia and Egypt. Another is the failure to mention the elephant. If a large part of the Old Testament was written in the Greek period, it is noteworthy that this animal, which constituted the main arm of the military service from the time of Alexander down to the time of the Romans should never be noticed even in the psalms which are alleged to be from Maccabean times. Especially is it noteworthy, when we find the elephant playing so prominent a part in the wars of the Maccabees.

7. As to the appropriateness of the proper names of persons with the times in which they are said to have lived, the following may be said:

(1) The names of persons in Genesis from Abraham to Joseph inclusive are in general such as the documents from the time of Hammurabi and from Egypt would lead us to

---

version was made, it is hard to see how the later Jews, who made the Targums and Talmuds, should not have understood their sense.

[115] The versions show that the translators no longer understood exactly what animals were meant in the lists of Lev. xi and Deut. xiv. The first ten chapters of Leviticus show unaccountable variations in respect to all kinds of things. In the words used in the four Aramaic versions to translate the names of the twelve stones in the breastplate, there are but a few agreements among the versions either with one another or with the original Hebrew. Not one of the Hebrew words is found in Mandean, only two or three in Syriac, two in Babylonian; and nine are not found in any Aramaic dialect. The technical vocabulary used to describe the tabernacle in Ex. xxvi f. is almost altogether different in the Hebrew and the Aramaic versions.

expect. Some of them have not as yet been found outside of the Scriptures, but in every case these exceptions have their parallels in form or sense in the documents of the pre-Mosaic age.[116]

(2) The names of persons from David to Ezra are entirely in harmony with the names to be expected and such as are found in the documents from Samaria, Moab, Assyria, and elsewhere.

(3) For the times between Joseph and David too little is known from extra-biblical documents to enable anyone to make a successful attack on the appropriateness of the names of persons mentioned in the Old Testament records.

8. Attacks upon the genuineness and authority of the history because it contains accounts of miracles will be made by those only who are unacquainted with ancient historic records. Whether what they thought to be miracles were really miracles, and wherein the miracles consisted, are proper subjects of investigation, but no one can successfully dispute that all ancient peoples believed in them and that all ancient records are full of accounts of them.[117] In fact, so much is this the case that a historic record claiming to be ancient which contained no account of supposed miracles might justly be suspected of being a forgery of later times.

9. In like manner, he who rejects a document merely because it contains what purport to be apocalypses, or predictions, ignores the spirit, beliefs and practices of pre-Christian times. Whether a document is, or contains, a prediction and what the prediction means and whether and how it was fulfilled, are all proper subjects of investigation. But all ancient history reveals clearly that the nations believed sincerely in the possibility and in the fact of the revelation of the will of the God or gods whom they worshipped. None but a deist, or an atheist, will deny their possibility. Theists must admit that they may have occurred. Christians

[116] See my article in the *Bible Student* for 1903.

[117] See my article on "Jonah" and on "What does 'The Sun stood still' mean?" in this Review for 1918.

will believe that the probability of their occurrence is involved in the mission of Jesus, the Word made flesh, through whom God in these latter days hath spoken unto us as in old times He spake through the prophets. Attacks upon Isaiah, Daniel and other books, because they abound in wonderful predictions, will have weight only with those who deny the fundamentals of Christianity. To one who believes in the Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ, the Son of God, and in the preparation of the world for his coming, the predictions of the Old Testament are but the glimmerings of rosy-fingered dawn before the full-orbed sun bursts forth as the light of a darkened world.

10. The objections made to the genuineness of certain parts of the Old Testament upon the ground that they contain ideas found in extra-biblical literature only in documents from an age later than the supposed date of the biblical document might be taken with seriousness if they were made by an atheist or deist, but when made by one who claims to be a theist and to believe in a revelation, and when they occur in what purports to be a revelation, they seem too puerile to be even considered with patience and equanimity. What! Must Jehovah have derived his ideas of the resurrection from the Persians? Whence then did they derive them? And what care I for their ideas more than for those of Plato, or Ingersoll, or Lodge, or Wells, or even my own? (May I be pardoned for the presumption of even assuming to know as much about such subjects as these aforesaid great men of the earth? I know nothing. They know nothing. Things that are equal to the same thing, &c.) And yet, the critics deny the authorship of Is. xxiv-xxvii by Isaiah, and assert that Daniel is later than the fifth century B.C., on the ground among others, that the future resurrection is predicted in these documents on the authority of God. Oh, mortal man, canst thou bind the cords of Orion, or set a bound to the wisdom and foreknowledge of the Almighty?[118]

[118] Reader! Stop here and read Job xxxviii-xli.

11. The most specious objection made to the Mosaic date and historical character of the Pentateuch is based upon the infrequent references to the laws, especially those of H and P, found in the books of Judges, Samuel and Kings; and further, upon the fact that the observances noted are often contrary to the requirements of the law. The force of this objection is broken by the following considerations, to wit: that the purpose of the books of Judges, Samuel and Kings, the critics themselves being witnesses, was not to give us a history of the religious institutions of Israel. "The stories of the deliverance of Israel represent only certain glorious moments in the history of these centuries,"[119] "The subject of the book of Samuel is the creation of a united Israel by Samuel, Saul, and David."[120] With this purpose in mind the authors generally make allusions to the law and the religious institutions and observances only in so far as they affect the history of the kings and nations whose fortunes it is the aim of the author to describe and moralize upon. The rule of conduct for the people they rightly find in the codes of E and D and in the words of the prophets. On the other hand, the book of Chronicles was a history meant to confine itself "to matters still interesting to the theocracy of Zion, keeping Jerusalem and the temple in the foreground, and developing the divine pragmatism of the history, with reference, not so much to the prophetic word as to the fixed legislation of the Pentateuch (especially the Priests' Code), so that the whole narrative might be made to teach that Israel's glory lies in the observance of the divine law and ritual."[121] Keeping in mind the difference in purpose on the part of the writer of Chronicles it is easy to understand his frequent references to the laws of H and P as well as to those of E and D. Judges, Samuel, and Kings give an epitome of the history of Israel primarily from the political and moral side; Chron-

[119] G. F. Moore in *Enc. Bib.*, p. 2641.
[120] W. Robertson Smith and Ed. König in *Enc. Bib.*, p. 2664.
[121] W. R. Smith and S. R. Driver in *Enc. Bib.*, p. 765.

icles, primarily from the legal and religious side. The conquest, the wars, the erection of the temple as the symbol of the unity of Israel, the division of the kingdom and the history of the two parts of it, and the final destruction of both kingdoms with the causes and manner thereof, constituted the subject matter of the prophetic history; the priestly writer on the other hand, gives the history of the kings and of the nations only as a background to his picture of the ecclesiastical and liturgical development of Israel based upon the prescriptions of the law of Moses. The prophetical writers dwell more upon the breaches of the laws, the priestly writer more upon the observance of them. In order to maintain their assertion that the laws of H and P are not mentioned in the history, the critics must and do deny the reliability of the history recorded in Chronicles. The force of their objection, therefore, depends upon the ability of the critics to establish the unhistorical character of the material facts recorded in the works of Ezra, Nehemiah and Chronicles in so far as they give information additional to, or in apparent conflict with what we find in the older books.

12. As to the conclusion of the radical critics that the books of Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah are unreliable, the following may be said:

(1) It is based upon the assumption that the writers had as sources nothing but the present books of the Old Testament from Genesis to Kings inclusive, supplemented by certain post-exilic works which have long since perished. Since it is admitted by all that the earlier documents of the Old Testament, such as J, E, D, Samuel, Hosea, Amos and the sources of Kings, passed unscathed through the fire and destruction accompanying the fall of Samaria and Jerusalem, it cannot be assumed that other records also may not have been preserved. The Chronicler himself asserts that he had access to such sources, or at least to works derived from such sources.

No other writer of the Old Testament cites his authorities so frequently and so explicitly. That he recasts his material in his own style and language and with remarks and comments of his own, no more invalidates the reliability of his facts than do similar methods in the case of Gibbon, Prescott, and Mommsen. That he inserts his own notes and comments no more throws doubt on his citation of facts than is true in the case of the books of Kings.

Against the express statements of authorities given by the Chronicler, what evidence have the critics to produce? Nothing but conjectures. Nothing but surmises and opinions based on their own ignorance and the silence of other records. Are the critics going to maintain that many works of pre-captivity times did not survive the destruction of Jerusalem and afterwards perish? How then about the sources of Kings? Are they going to maintain that all the works ever written have been cited in the books older than Chronicles, that the *Book of Jasher* and the *Book of the Wars of Jehovah* are the only ones that have disappeared? How about the three thousand proverbs of Solomon and his songs a thousand and five? How about the records of the kings of Israel and Judah as to which it is said so often in Kings that the rest of the deeds of the kings were written in them? If, as Dr. Driver says,[122] "it was not the Chronicler's intention to pervert the history," why should he have invented or perverted the sources from which he claims to get his information? The present-day critics, living just about 2300 years after the Chronicler wrote his books, may dispute about his statements and deny his facts, and even the existence of the documents which he cites; but most sensible men without preconceived opinions will probably agree with me that the Chronicler is more likely to have been right and to have told the truth, especially about the

[122] LOT, 533.

records which he used, than any man to-day. The testimony of the Chronicler cannot be overthrown by the *opinion* of anyone now living.

(2) It is not fair to reject one or both of two apparently irreconcilable statements because *we* cannot explain them. Sometimes apparent difficulties can be removed by a change of the pointing or interpretation of the original Hebrew.[123] Sometimes the objections are based on an interpretation of the original which creates a discrepancy where none really exists.[124]

(3) One of the most serious charges made against the Chronicler is that he exaggerates in his numerical statements. Thus, he makes the army of Jeroboam I to be 800,000 and that of Abijah 400,000; Zera with 1,000,000 men meets Asa with 580,000; and Jehoshaphat has an army of 1,160,000. If, however, this is an argument against the historicity of Chronicles, it may be used also against Samuel

[123] Thus וישב in I Kings xii. 2 may be pointed and read as "and he returned" or as "and he dwelt." מתי in 2 Kings xxiii. 30 may be rendered "dying" rather than "dead" and so be made to harmonize with 2 Chron. xxxv. 24, where it is said that Josiah died in Jerusalem.

[124] Thus, it is said that there is an inexplicable disagreement between the account of Athaliah's overthrow as given in 2 Kings xi. 4 f. and that given in 2 Chron. xxiii. 1 f. This assumed disagreement is based primarily upon the assumption that the *Kāri* (כרי) and runners of Kings could not have been Levites as Chronicles would seem to demand. Doubt, however, as to the meaning of *Kāri* is manifest, when we see that Gesenius, in his *Thesaurus* (671 b), gives four meanings as being upheld by various scholars, to which may be added several from the versions and one or two from recent scholars. If we connect it with the Asyrian *karu* "to cut," a synonym of *karatu,* it will be a synonym of כרתי and mean "executioner" like *ṭabbaḥ* in Gen. xxxix. 1. If we connect it with the Assyrian *kararu,* a synonym of *eteru* and *šuzubu* "to surround, either for protection or capture" (Muss-Arnolt 25 b), it might well mean "body-guard." The פלתי, so frequently used with כרתי, may be connected with the Assyrian *pultu, paštu* "sword." Compare Syriac *pusta* "ascia, securis." That runners might be Levites, and even priests, is shown by the fact that Ahimaaz, David's runner, was a son of Zadok the priest (2 Sam. xviii. 19 f.). Until the meaning of these terms has been fixed, we are justified merely in saying that some of the details of the account are not clear to us. This does not mean that they are not true.

and Kings; for the Philistines have 30,000 chariots (1 Sam. xiii. 5), David slew 40,000 horsemen of the Syrians in one battle (2 Sam. x. 18), Joab numbered 800,000 men of Israel and 500,000 of Judah (2 Sam. xxiv. 9), Solomon had 40,000 stalls of horses (1 Kings v. 6 [iv. 24]), Rehoboam had 180,000 chosen men which were warriors (1 Kings xii. 21), and the children of Israel slew 100,000 Syrians in one day (1 Kings xx. 29). And it cannot be maintained that the Chronicler exaggerated regularly the numbers as given in Kings, since in the seventeen cases where the numbers differ as between the two books, the text of Kings is greater in five and that of the Chronicler in twelve.[125]

In view, then, of the fact that the prophetical history, as well as the priestly, contains these large enumerations, it seems best to maintain either that the enumerations are correct, or that they have been corrupted in the course of transmission. We are not so sure as some seem to be that they are not correct. We are not to look upon the armies of those days as composed of drilled troops like the Macedonian phalanxes, or the Roman legions, but as levies *en masse,* embracing all the people from about fourteen to twenty years of age and upward, a whole nation in arms. Every man was interested in the wars, because defeat meant death or captivity to all alike. Besides, they were fighting at their own doorsteps and for their hearths and homes. When we think of the enormous disciplined armies which single cities such as Nineveh, Damascus, Tyre, Ekron, Gaza, Sparta, and Rome, used to put into the field, we may well pause before affirming with such assurance as some do that the figures of the books of Kings and Chronicles are incredible. But, if some think they are incredible, let them remember that numbers, especially when denoted by a system of notation, are the hardest of all facts to transmit correctly. There is usually nothing in the context to preserve them from corruption. They may have been misread in the original sources or changed in the course of copying; but only those who have

never engaged in the study of manuscripts will indict a whole document simply because some of the numerical notations are beyond the possibility of being read with certainty or accepted as original.

(4) In order to prove the untrustworthiness of the Chronicler, an attempt is made to show that his work was not written till about 300 B.C. The first proof of this is said to be found in 1 Chron. iii. The text of this passage is admitted to vary so much that commentators are not sure whether six or thirteen generations are meant. According to Dr. Driver, the Hebrew text gives six generations from Zerubbabel onward. If we place him at 520 B.C. and count twenty years to a generation, this will bring us to 400 B.C., as the date of the book. Twenty years to a generation is a good Oriental average.[126]

(5) Another proof of the lateness of the Chronicler is said to be the mention of Jaddua as High Priest in Neh. xii. 11, 22. It is assumed that this Jaddua is the same as the one mentioned by Josephus[127] as the High Priest who went out to meet Alexander when he went up to Jerusalem. Inasmuch as this expedition of Alexander is recorded by Josephus alone and said by the critics never to have occurred, and as the particular Jaddua who is said by Josephus to have met Alexander is mentioned nowhere else either by Josephus or by any other ancient writer, we fail to see the force of this argument. For, if Josephus invented the story about Alexander, he may have invented his Jaddua, too. But granting that there was a Jaddua at 336 B.C., or thereabout, we fail to see why he may not have been High Priest for seventy or even eighty years. Having had a great-grandfather who lived to be hale and hearty at 105, and a great-grandmother to be 99, and three great-uncles to be 94, 96 and 101 respectively, with about a dozen other relatives, no farther away than a great uncle, who lived to be from 75 to 92, and all *compos mentis,* and most active in

126 See Assiyuti's *History of the Califs,* where generations are often only for 16 or 18 years.

127 *Antiquities,* XI. viii, 4.

body till almost the end, the writer of this article can see nothing improbable in the Jaddua of Josephus having been the same as the Jaddua of Ezra.

(6) The newest weapon of proof, however, that has been forged against the historicity of the Chronicler is that which has been produced in the arsenal of Oxford by Drs. Driver and Gray. The great German critic Ewald asserted that it was both unnecessary and contrary to contemporary usage for the kings of Persia to be given the title, king of Persia, while as yet there were kings of Persia; and that consequently the Hebrew documents employing this title must have been written after kings of Persia had ceased to exist. If this were absolutely true, it would bring down to Greek times the composition of Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah and Daniel, since they all contain the title. It is a sufficient answer to this assertion to say that eighteen different authors in nineteen different documents from Persian times use this title altogether thirty-eight different times, and of at least six different Persian kings; that it is used of Cyrus seven years before the conquest of Babylon in 539 B.C. and of Artaxerxes III about 365 B.C.; that it is used in Persian, Susian, Babylonian, Greek, Aramaic and Hebrew; that it was used in Media, Babylonia, Asia Minor, Greece, and Palestine, and according to Herodotus in Ethiopia; and that it is used in letters, dates and other like documents of the Scriptures just as it is used in the extra-biblical documents. Further, it has been shown that it was not common for authors of the Greek period to use the title.[128]

G. Religion

Before closing this succinct review of the lines of defense of the Old Testament Scriptures, we must emphasize briefly the strongest bulwark of them all, the undeniable uniqueness and superlative clearness and importance of the religious ideas contained in them.

[128] See my articles in this Review for 1904-5 and for 1917, and in the *Sachau Denkschrift,* Berlin, 1912.

A study of the religious systems of the Egyptians, Babylonians, and other ancient peoples, has revealed to us a groping after God, if haply they might find him; but nowhere among all the nations is it recorded that a clear apprehension of one living and true God—the creator and preserver, the guide, the judge, the savior, and the sanctifier of his people—was attained. Other religions are outward, concerned with words and deeds. Their sins are offenses or delinquencies, their substitutions are material equivalents, their atonements are physical purifications, their resurrection is a groundless expectation; their judgment is without mercy, their immortality consigns to darkness and dust, and a future life of joy is at best for the few and great. The Old Testament religion is essentially inward. It is the religion of the mind and heart, of love, joy, *faith,* hope, and salvation through the grace of God alone. How account for this religion? The prophets say it came from God. No other theory of its origin can account for its uniqueness and its results, its superiority and its influence. The prophets and their ideas are facts in evidence, which all the quibbling of the critics cannot impugn. The prophets say they had their ideas from God. If not, whence? If so, the greatest of all miracles has happened involving all the rest. For if God spake through the prophets, his revelations of his will could not have been bound by the shackles of time and circumstance. The prophets who spake for him spake not merely as the men of their own time, but as men of all time, as men who were spokesmen of Him who knows the end from the beginning, and has all power in heaven and on earth. The canon of the modern critical school that treats the prophets as the creatures of their time is antagonistic to this fundamental conception of the prophets' mission as it was enunciated by the prophets themselves. They say God spake *to* them and they spake *for* God. The critics say that they gave utterance to the spirit of the times (the *Zeitgeist*) and that they were limited by the time and place of their

birth. But, if this were all the source of their information, how then did it come, that not from the oracles of Thebes and Memphis, nor from the temples of Babylon, nor from the sacred precincts of Delphi, nor from the Sibyls and augurs of Rome, but from the deserts of Midian, and from the sheepfolds of Tekoa, and from the dungeons of Zedekiah, and from the lowly cots of captives on the banks of the Chebar and the Euphrates, came forth those magic words of hope and salvation and glory for a sin-cursed world that have made the desert hearts of all who heard them to rejoice and blossom like the rose in the sunlight of God's favor, in the revivifying atmosphere of his presence? God with us! This is the key to unlock the mysterious chambers of the Old Testament.

Conclusion

But the time has come to conclude this somewhat sketchy summary of evidence for the defense in the case of the critics against the Old Testament. We hope that the evidence adduced will be sufficient to convince those who have read the articles that the general reliability of the Old Testament documents has not been impaired. The literary forms are in harmony with what comparative literature would lead us to expect. The civil, criminal and constitutional laws agree with what the civilization of the ancient nations surrounding Palestine would presuppose; while the ceremonial, moral, and religious laws are differentiated from those of others by their genesis in a monotheistic belief and a divine revelation. The use of writing in the age of Moses and Abraham is admitted by all and the existence of the Hebrew language in the time of the Exodus is assured by the glosses of the Amarna letters, as well as by the proper names on the Egyptian and Babylonian monuments. The general correctness of the Hebrew text that has been transmitted to us is established beyond just grounds of controversy. The morphology, syntax, and meaning of the language of

the various books conform with what the face of the documents demands. The chronological and geographical statements are more accurate and reliable than those afforded by any other ancient documents; and the biographical and other historical narratives harmonize marvelously with the evidence afforded by extra-biblical documents.

We therefore, send this essay forth with the prayer that it may strengthen the faith of those who still believe in God and in Jesus Christ his Son. We need not and do not fear the truth about the Bible. We welcome all sincere and honest study of its origin, purpose and meaning. But is it too much to ask and hope that more of those who have been appointed by the Church to teach its history and its doctrines should devote their time and energies to the defense of its great and fundamental, unique and outstanding, facts and implications, rather than to the picking of flaws in the garments of the prophets and to the punching of holes in the robe of Christ's perfection? It may not be ours to remove all the difficulties, to harmonize all the apparent inconsistencies, to explain all the mysteries, and to solve all the problems of the Old Testament; but we can show at least, that we believe that Christ and the Apostles are more likely to be right than we, that the age-long judgment of the Church with respect to the Bible may after all be right, and that our business is to defend with all lawful means the citadel of faith rather than to join the hosts of the infidel in the assaults upon its walls.

Princeton. ROBERT DICK WILSON.

HUMAN NATURE AND CHRISTIAN NURTURE.*

In the second letter to Timothy the great apostle uses two expressions in describing the Christian worker, ὀρθοτομοῦντα τὸν λόγον τῆς ἀληθείας and διδακτικόν[1], which in combination represent an ideal towards which every Christian minister and teacher should strive. On the one hand he must be loyal to the Gospel as revealed by Jesus and the Apostles; on the other he must be apt and skilful in teaching. The latter aspect of the ideal brings into view an art which the Church has always assumed to be rightfully within the sphere of its activity, but which not infrequently it has much neglected, the art of Christian Nurture. For the Church must not only formulate the truth and defend it against assault, must not merely proclaim it in order to evangelize men in the popular meaning of the term, must not throw its influence solely to beneficial social schemes, but must also devote time and energy to the task of training the individual in the Christian life. This is the topic to be considered in this essay.

For the efficient practice of this as of any art, three things at least seen to be necessary; first, a clear notion of what is to be done; second, an exact estimate of the material upon which the art is to be exercised; third, a skilful employment of all the available resources. The attempt will be made to elaborate each of these points.

I.

The aim of Christian nurture has been very variously defined according to the emphasis laid now on this and now on that content of Christianity. In a recent book[2] five ways

* In a previous article, "Christian Education and Presbyterian Tradition", published in this Review, January, 1919, proof was given for the assertion that Christian Education as developed in the theory and practice of the Calvinistic Churches consisted in bringing the entire field of educational endeavor under the dominion of Christ's person, act, and word. In the present article the attempt will be to show what this principle implies with reference to the moral education of the individual.

[1] 2 Tim. ii. 15, 25.

in which the aim of Christian training has been conceived are mentioned: to instruct in the things that a Christian ought to know; to prepare for full membership in the church; to save the child's soul; to unfold religious capacities or a germinal divine life already within the individual; to produce Christian character. The author acknowledges that there are elements of worth in each view, but rejects them as failing to do justice "to the social idealism that characterizes the most vigorous Christian thought of the day," and would replace them by this statement of the aim of Christian nurture, as "growth of the young toward and into mature and efficient devotion to the democracy of God, and happy self-realization therein."[3] Another writer[4] is of the opinion that the aim ought to be the development of the ideas of life that lie implicit in our still new science and our still newer democracy. Another[4a] would make the aim, seemingly, the effective development of the ideals that grow out of the basic instincts. Still another authority[5] defines it as "training and instruction in the life of the larger, infinite spiritual society." Professor Hocking[6] thinks of the aim as the remaking of men guided by "a spark not lighted in 'nature' as commonly understood," a spark which, if we understand him rightly, is the Absolute that climbs to a soul not merely in grass and flowers, but also in men. These quotations might be extended indefinitely, but they will suffice to show the variant, indeed contradictory, statements of the aim found in present books on our topic.

We may be permitted then in view of such variation to examine the procedure of the Apostle whose life-work it was to preach the Gospel to the Gentile world, and who in carrying out the task laid great emphasis on Christian

---

[2] G. A. Coe, *A Social Theory of Religious Education,* p. 53.

[3] *Op. cit.* p. 55.

[4] Professor Dewey in *The Hibbert Journal,* July, 1908, p. 808.

[4a] W. C. Bagley, *Educational Values,* p. 162.

[5] H. F. Cope, *Religious Education* in the Church, p. 36.

[6] *Human Nature and Its Remaking,* pp. 33, 402.

nurture. Can we ascertain his notion of the aim? Let us recall the stress he places on the will of God as the conditioning limit of human behavior. At once the thought is suggested that if some expression can be found in Paul's writing to indicate the divine will with reference to human nature, it may be possible to derive from it the Apostle's notion of the aim of Christian nurture. Such an expression is found in Romans viii. 29, "For whom he fore-knew, he also foreordained to be conformed to the image of his Son." From this passage may be deduced a formulation of the aim of Christian nurture that will we are sure be in harmony with Paul's practice, and that will serve as a useful guide for our own action in this great art.

The meaning of the words may be approached by noticing the grammatical structure. The term *συμμόρφους* although classed among the adjectives, here acts like a noun[7] and is determined by the genitive *τῆς εἰκόνος* which in turn is determined by a second genitive *τοῦ υἱοῦ* and this in its turn by a third genitive *αὐτοῦ*. Thus the words may be roughly translated "foreordained as form-sharers of the image of his son," meaning that it is the divine purpose to form in this world a likeness of Jesus Christ in which all who love God are to share. This likeness is not to be arbitrarily interpreted with some as eschatological merely, as referring only to the heavenly body to be possessed hereafter by the lovers of God, but must be taken to include the Christ-like mind and character possessed in some degree here and now by all believers.

If this approximates the meaning of the Apostle as to the divine purpose, then it should follow that Christian nurture, in so far as it is placed in human power, should aim at evoking in the individual and in society the image of Jesus Christ. That this was Paul's view may be proved by a consideration of the following passages. He writes to the Galatians,[8] "My little children, of whom I am again in

[7] As noted by A. T. Robertson, *Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, p. 528.

[8] iv. 19.

travail until Christ be formed in you;" to the Colossians[9] that the "Christian mystery" is "Christ in you." In the letter to the Ephesians he points out that the Church has been endowed by the victorious Lord with different functionaries "for the perfecting of the saints, unto the work of ministering, unto the building up of the body of Christ: till we all attain unto the unity of faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a fullgrown man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ."[10] The same thought underlies the exhortation to the members of the church in Rome, to "put on Christ;"[11] a putting on" that comes first in Baptism,[12] but must be continually renewed, as in the letter to the Ephesians,[13] "Put on the new man, that after God hath been created in righteousness and holiness of truth." The same aim may be seen in the wonderful prayer[14] that Christ might dwell in the heart of the believer by faith. Once more it is Paul's teaching that the νοῦς of Christ is to be in the Christians;[15] the πνεῦμα also,[16] and that the σπλάγχα[17] with the body and all its members are to be Christ's. Christian growth finally is described as a transformation into the image of Christ.[18] With these citations before us, there can hardly be doubt

---

[9] i. 24.

[10] iv. 12f.

[11] Romans xiii. 14, with which read Augustine's famous words—(Confess. VIII. 12, 23) *Ecce audio uocem de uicina domo cum cantu dicentis et crebro repetentis quasi pueri an puellae, nescio: "tolle lege, tolle, lege." . . . arripui, aperui et legi in silentio capitulam, quo primum coniecti sunt oculi mei: non in commisationibus et ebrietatibus, non in cubilibus et inpudicitiis, non in contentione et aemulatione, sed induite dominum Iesum Christum et carnis prouidentiam ne feceritis in concupiscentiis. nec ultra uolui legere nec opus erat. statim quippe cum fine huiusce sententiae quasi luce securitatis infusa cordi meo omnes dubitationis tenebrae diffugerunt.*

[12] Rom. vi. 3; Gal. iii. 27.

[13] iv. 24; also Col. iii. 12.

[14] Eph. iii. 17.

[15] I Cor. ii. 16.

[16] Rom. viii. 9.

[17] Phil. i. 8.

[18] 2 Cor. iii. 18.

as to how the Apostle would define the aim of Christian nurture.

But in what consists this likeness to Christ? Theological discussion has busied itself for the most part with the consideration of the meaning of the Image of God in man[19] with the purpose of determining what characteristics man has lost and retained in consequence of the fall. Here the interest is legitimately enough theological and metaphysical. For our present purpose, however, we must take an ethical point of view. This implies that we start with the practical situation in which ethical action originates, and from the study of which the practical nature of the ethical may be determined. If this method is applied to the definition of the ethical content of the image of Christ it will mean that the characteristics of the image are to be discovered, not mystically by positing the existence in the believer of a transcendent Christ who works out in the action of the believer, but historically by observation of the way in which the Lord reacted in the situations in which he found himself during his earthly career. As a matter of fact it may be proved that the latter method is followed by the Apostle, for however much Paul has to say about the risen and glorified Christ it still remains true that the conduct that is to serve as norm for the art of Christian nurture, is the conduct of the Saviour as he lived on earth.[20]

The purpose of Paul was, of course, not that of writing a biography of the Lord, and we must never lose sight of the literary medium he employs,[21] but it still remains true that most of the passages in which use is made of the life of Christ as an example for Christians, are so written as to emphasize not any vague characteristic, but a very definite

---

[19] For a review of the discussion see H. Bavinck, *Gereformeerde Dogmatiek*, 1908. Vol. II, pp. 566-605 *"Het Wezen van den mensch."*

[20] Cf. Calvin, *Institutio* III, VI, III, *Ac, quo melius nos expergefaciat, ostendit Deum, patrem, quemadmodum nos sibi in Christo suo conciliavit, ita in eo nobis imaginem signasse adquam nos conformari velit.*

[21] Cf. R. J. Knowling's remarks on page 211, foot, of *The Testimony of St. Paul to Christ.*

mode of response to a very definite situation, or conduct. In our investigation we must attend not merely to the specific events mentioned, but also to what may be called the background, the implications of even those matters in which the theological interest seems paramount.[22] The situation of being born an Israelite was met by our Lord by the ministry of helpful service and redemptive compassion.[23] The circumstance of poverty, a circumstance in which so many of Paul's converts found themselves, became the opportunity of making many spiritually rich.[24] The common experience of earthly suffering he met with that particular joy called "of the Holy Ghost."[25] But it was the situation in which sin in the form of selfishness, hate, persecution, and death, was to be met that seemingly attracted the Apostle's regard, for it was so similar to that in which he and his churches were. The thought of impending death did not prevent the Lord from caring for his own, for "in the night in which he was betrayed"[26] he instituted the comforting communion feast; death he met by conformity to God's will[27] and by not pleasing himself,[27a] and by showing his sacrificial love.[28] These are but a few of the passages that might be cited. Did space permit it would be entirely possible to show how the thought of the Apostle is saturated with the conduct of Christ.

By way of summary let us attempt to collect the content of the likeness of Christ in a series of adjectives that may be said to describe the behavior that it is the aim of Christian nurture to produce.[28] They are obedient to God,

---

22 Cf. Richard Drescher, *Das Leben Jesu bei Paulus*, especially pages 23-26. A. Ritschl, *Unterricht in der Christlichen Religion* § 50. a.

23 Rom. xv. 8; Gal. iv.4.

24 2 Cor. viii. 9.

25 1 Thess. i. 6.

26 1 Cor. xi. 23.

27 Rom. v. 19.

27a Rom. xv. 2.

28 Gal. ii. 20; 2 Cor. v. 14.

29 The same attempt has been made for the character that is demanded of the human being who would "be a great success as a

loving, unselfish, devoted, gentle, meek, humble, peaceful, sincere, righteous. The person who achieves these has gained the image of Christ so far as we can define that image by the conduct displayed in his earthly career.[30]

II.

What now of the nature that is to be transformed, the material upon which the art of Christian nurture is to exercise its activity? Our title calls it human nature and by this phrase we shall mean first, the individual, and shall make a plea for a better appreciation of individuality for its own sake and as an object of worth in itself considered. There seems reason for this plea because in the three main ways in which the activity of the Church finds expression, the individual does not come to his rights.[31]

In one form of activity the church devotes itself to the exposition and defence of the truth. But often this, like the liturgical service of God, has been carried on with little regard for those to whom the truth was supposedly being expounded. The impersonal demands of logical formulation rose above the claims of individual rhetorical persuasion. The appeal of objective truth diverted the attention from subjective application. It is not to be denied that in this there may be elements of value, but it is merely stating the fact when it is said that the character of the individual tends to be lost sight of and that there is little effort to apply the truth to him.

A second activity of the church is worship, with which

citizen of a democratic state and worthy of life among a free people," by Milton Fairchild in "The Important Centres of Character," *School and Society*, May 10, 1919, p. 566.

[30] It hardly needs remark that this list is unacceptable to those who think of Christ as presenting an ideal for an ideal society, not for the present, and to those who look upon the conduct of Christ as unfitting a modern state. But that it summarizes the main features of the Saviour as ethically presented by the Apostle Paul, admits of little doubt.

[31] Our plea is not for individualism, but for the recognition of individuality.

there has come to be combined instruction. Public worship is social and the instruction that is united with it is what has been termed "mass" instruction. We are concerned with the latter. The Directory for Worship states that "the subject of a sermon should be some verse or verses of Scripture: and its object, to explain, defend and apply some part of the system of divine truth; or, to point out the nature and state the bounds and obligation, of some duty." The present tendency is to make the instruction embrace sociology, politics, hygiene, thrift, conservation of natural resources, child-saving, patriotism, and many other desirable matters, whose claim for recognition is in the fact that they belong to the things that religion should influence. The inclusion of such matters in the service shows the growing prominence of the instructional side, and, at the same time, the danger of forgetting individuality. The audience is not the individual; the haranguing of the crowd may not affect the individual at all; something must be done to supplement the instructor's rough average estimate, if Christian nurture is to do its perfect work.

In a third activity the emphasis is neither on the formulation of the truth, nor on worship and instruction, but on environment. The aim is the production of a better society in which and through which God will be better known and loved. Here, if possible, the individual may come less to his rights than in either of the other activities, for the eye of the worker being on the social environment, he may consider the individual an abstraction, and therefore valueless except for society, the real being. This is not the inevitable tendency of this form of activity, but it is usual as may be seen from the manner of expression generally found. Education consists in the provision of an environment in which individuals will react in socially advantageous ways. Education aims, therefore, at "social adjustment and social efficiency," at "the intergration of the individual into society." The individual has no value in himself or for God, but for Society; his salvation consists not in saving his

"soul," for the soul is an abstraction, but in approving and practicing the precepts of the social gospel.

There is danger of exaggeration in all characterizations, but making due allowance for overstatement in the foregoing, let us convince ourselves of the need of understanding the individual. We cannot get rid of him; we must use him in any form of activity in which we engage; therefore it is a worthy endeavor to sketch for ourselves the way to come to knowledge of what has been termed the "personal equation."[32] By this phrase is meant[33] that if we could list all the characteristics of human nature, and measure in some way the amount of each possessed by a given individual, the result would be an equation in which one member would be the given individual, and the other the sum of traits that make up his character. Such an equation cannot be exactly written for any man, but it symbolizes roughly the procedure of any one who tries to understand the individual. Let us notice that this operation implies: first, an understanding of the characteristics possessed by the type to which the individual belongs; and, second, an estimate of the kind and amount of variation from the general type of the individual in question.

The first task is the attempt of Psychology, the aim of which is to point out the common qualities, processes, and modes of activity found in human beings generally, or of that part of Theology that treats of man in his actual and ideal relations to God, or of man as the "subject" of the Kingdom of God. The Christian teacher will know the results of these studies, but he will also never fail to keep in mind the viewpoint of the great Teacher. For although a finished Psychology is not to be found in the teaching of our Lord, nevertheless his words are not used at random,[34] and

[32] *Psychological Bulletin,* May, 1918. "The Conditions of Effective Human Action", by Raymond Dodge.

[33] Cf. E. L. Thorndike, *Individuality,* p. 5.

[34] The words of the "father" of Biblical Theology, Magnus Friedrich Roos, in his *Fundamenta Psychologiae ex Sacri Scriptura Collecta* (1769) are worth remembering—*"Bei dieser Arbeit nahm ich mir zur*

his procedure contains a permanent point of view. In regard to the former point, our Lord's teaching shows that he looked upon man as composed of two parts: the body, or visible; the spirit, or invisible part. Each part has its claim, but the latter is by far the more important, since without it the body is dead,[35] and although men may separate it from the body and so kill the body, they cannot kill it.[36] Again if it is a question of losing a corporeal member or damaging the non-corporeal portion, the Lord recommends the former.[37] Furthermore the purity without which no one can see God is an element of the invisible portion of man's nature.[38] The elements of the spiritual part of man's nature may be conveniently examined in that text in which the four (or three) constituents are grouped, the Shema that was recited twice daily by every pious Israelite.[39] The interpretations of this passage are curiously indicative of the results that come when attempts are made to find in the Scripture the thoughts of the current Psychology.[40] Common to all

---

Richtschnur: Kein Wörtlein sei von dem durch Gottes Geist getriebenen Verfasser auf's Gerathewohl hingesetzt, und es herrsche durchweg in der heiligen Schrift eine Gotteswürdige Genauigkeit und Bundigkeit."

35 Matt. xxvii, 50; Luke viii.

36 Matt. x. 28; Luke xii. 4.

37 Matt. v. 29-30.

38 Matt v. xv. 2 *seq.*

39 The table of variations is as follows:

Deut. vi. 5	Hebrew	לב	נפש	מאד	
	LXX	Καρδία	ψυχή	διάνοια	
Matt. xxii. 37		Καρδία	ψυχή	διάνοια	
Mark xii. 30		Καρδία	ψυχή	διάνοια	ἰσχύς
Luke x. 21		Καρδία	ψυχή	ἰσχύς	διάνοια

40 Some typical interpretations are the following: A. Carr in the *Cambridge Greek Testament* on Matt. xxii. 37 "Καρδία includes the emotions, will, purpose; ψυχή, the spiritual faculties; διάνοια, the intellect, the thinking faculty." Meyer thinks that by Καρδία Matthew means the internal consciousness of the person; by ψυχή the faculty of feeling and desiring; by διάνοια the force of thought and of will Morrison in the *Practical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Matthew* says: "The words heart, soul, mind represent different aspects of one substantive entity, the one spiritual element of our nature, whether that element be metaphysically simple or in some

the variant forms are the two words "heart" and "soul" the meanings of which are not difficult to determine if we confine ourselves to the New Testament usage and do not attempt to read into them ideas derived from later psychological development. "Heart" is the spiritual organ opposed to the physical organs, and as such is the centre of all the desires, thoughts, inclinations, etc. that make up men's spiritual life. It is the focus of this life, the treasure house out of which the good and evil come, the centre where purity must dwell if one is to please God. The "soul" is a name for the entire life that uses the heart and centers there. To lose or save and give one's soul is to lose or save or give one's life.[41] To worry over present or future food or clothing is to be anxious for the ψυχή.[42] It is a name for a life that is not limited to the present world—men cannot kill it—and it is therefore a treasure surpassing the material world. It is also the bearer of sentiment and impression. Jesus promises rest to the soul, and said in the garden, "my soul is exceeding sorrowful."[43] "Thought" appears only twelve times in the entire New Testament and denotes the cognitive and reflective aspect of life. It has many synonyms:

---

respect constituted and compound. It is the heart or centre of our complex being. It is the soul, the seat of sensations and feelings in general. It is the mind, that in us which perceives and thinks and understands." In the *Internat Crit. Com. on St. Mark* xii. 30, E. P. Gould says, "Καρδία is the general word for the inner man; διάνοια is the soul, the life principle, ψυχή is the mind, and ἰσχύς is the strength. There is no attempt at classification, or exactness of statement, but simply to express in a strong way the whole being." In commenting on *St. Luke* x. 27, A. Plummer (*Internat. Crit.*) says, "here we have four powers with which God is to be loved. . . . They cover man's physical, intellectual, and moral activity." Driver's comment on Deut. vi. 5 explains heart as the organ of intellect, and the soul as the organ of the desires or affections. It does not require much explanation to point out the confused and conflicting nature of these explanations.

[41] Matt. x. 39.

[42] The word πνεῦμα which does not occur in this list, seems in the usage of Jesus to be practically synonymous with ψυχή.

[43] Matt. xi. 29; xxvi. 38.

γνῶσις or knowledge;[44] σύνεσις or understanding;[45] φρόνησις or wisdom;[46] διαλογισμός or thought;[47] ἐνθύμησις or thought.[48] "Strength" occurs nine times and denotes the life in its aspect of deciding or willing. This word is closely akin to βούλημα[49] and θέλημα.[50] Each one of these terms is an aspect of the person considered at one given moment. "Heart" contains the notions of organ and centre; "soul" is a name for the entire spiritual life; "thought" and "strength" are names for it in the two easily distinguishable aspects of reflecting and deciding. There is no attempt to divide the person, but merely to denote its main aspects. The whole analysis forms a practicable psychological instrument for the work in hand.[51]

The Lord's viewpoint, however, is significant in its bearing on the second task mentioned above, the appreciation of individual differences. He looked on men not as indiscriminated multitudes, but as beings possessing infinite worth. The very hairs of their head were numbered; they were of more value than many spirits.[52] He addressed himself to individuals first, and to masses second. For him the individuals are equal in rights; are equally inviolable. The poor are equal to the rich; the little ones to the great ones; the woman equal to the man; the slave to the free, from this point of view. They differ, nevertheless, in individuality, and it is wonderfully instructive to notice the supreme skill with which the Lords meets the individual differences. At Capernaum two blind men follow him, crying, "Have mercy on us," but the Lord paid no heed; only when he was in the house and noticed that they had followed

---

44 Luke xi. 52.
45 Mark xii. 33; Luke ii. 47.
46 Luke i. 17.
47 Matt xv. 19.
48 Matt. ix. 4.
49 Rom. ix. 19.
50 Matt. vi. 10.
51 Cf. André Arnal, *La Personne Humaine dans les Evangiles*, pp. 8-17.
52 Matt. x. 30; Luke vi.

him, did he speak to them as if they were the sole persons in attendance.[53] At Jerusalem on the contrary he devoted himself to rousing the faith of a sick man who asked him for nothing, because thirty-eight years had deadened all hope. To the master of Israel he proposed the question of the new birth; to the Samaritan woman who ignored the divine law, he little by little brought home her sin and led her to confess him as the Messiah; he made the enthusiastic scribe who followed him, think seriously by reason of the brusqueness with which he addressed him. Thus it is seen that our Lord was conscious of that which all had in common, because they all belonged to the one type, man, and at the same time of that in which each differed individually from the common type.

This brief survey of the Lord's thought and practice should enable us, if we accept it as normative, to appreciate the help of present day Psychology for Christian nurture, and at the same time to avoid its hindrances. We might enumerate the helpful features as follows: The recognition of the position of the body as the instrument for the expression of the spirit's life and for this very reason to be maintained at the maximum of healthful activity; second, the determination of the basal equipment, the fundamental tendencies, of human nature and the laws of their change;[54] third, the fact of growth so often mentioned by the Lord, whereby there is a successive expansion of experience on different levels, a fact from which some deduce the consequence that children are incapable of religion, but which forms for the Christian believer the basis for the recognition of one of the most sweet and lovely things in the world: the child's devotion to Jesus the Saviour. There is last, the multitude of experimental studies now going on by which our knowledge of the laws of learning becomes each day more exact.

---

[53] Matt ix. 27-28.

[54] For a suggestive treatment of this topic see W. E. Hocking, *Human Nature and Its Remaking,* Part II.

The chief hindrance is the tendency to explain consciousness in terms of either mechanism or vitalism, and so to obscure the claim of the self for recognition. It is no exaggeration to say that neither of these tendencies, especially the former, can be made compatible with either the thought or the practice of our Lord as explained in the foregoing. Room must be made for personalism if not merely the positive descriptions, but also the theoretic background of psychology are to become completely available for the ends of Christian nurture.[55]

In our discussion we have not mentioned sin, because sin is not one of the materials upon which we work, but rather an obstacle we must meet. It is well to consider, however, the exact nature of the obstacle. It is not a substance; it can neither create nor destroy being; after sin entered human nature, man still had soul and body, the power of reflection and of will.[56] But if the matter of human nature is unchanged, yet the form, if we may use the term, has been altered, in that now human nature apart from Christ tends to serve the law of sin, not the law of God. In connection with the ten characteristics already mentioned as belonging to the image of Christ, it will be found that apart from Christ the human nature we have to work with does not tend to exemplify them.[57]

[55] For an exposition of present tendencies cf. Mary W. Calkin's presidential address before the last meeting of the American Philosophical Association, printed in *The Philosophical Review,* March, 1919, under the title, "The Personalistic Conception of Nature." Cf. also the literature mentioned in "The Self in Recent Philosophy," *Psychol. Bulletin* XIII, 1. p. 20.

[56] Cf. H. Bavinck, *Gereformeerde* Dogmatiek, III. p. 136 for a detailed exposition of this view.

[57] What is here said may perhaps be stated too theologically for the present viewpoint, but it is at least interesting to notice that even from the psychological side the "form" of sin is recognized. E. L. Thorndike in his *Educational Psychology,* Vol. 1. "The Original Nature of Man", Chapter xvii. recognizes vs. G. Stanley Hall and the sentimental advocates of "let nature caper," that, "The original tendencies of man have not been right, are not right, and probably never will be right." The new sense of sin, due in part to the war, may be seen explained in W. E. Hocking, *Human Nature and Its Remaking,* p. 111 seq.

III

The concluding question of our inquiry has to do with the resources available for the practice of our art. Once more let us look back to the source and ascertain the teaching of Paul concerning the matter. Let us take that most interesting passage in the second letter to the Corinthians.[58] Here the Apostle according to his custom selects an incident connected with the history of revelation in the Old Testament and contrasts with it an incident of the New Testament in order to show the surpassing character of the latter. The incident is that of the shining of the face of the great law-giver of ancient Israel after he had been in the presence of God. The parallel in the New Testament dispensation is that every believer reflects the glory of his Lord and in so doing is gradually transformed into the same image. This latter fact gives in symbolic form the Apostle's view of the resources available for our use in the work of Christian nurture. They are in a word Jesus Christ himself. The glory here mentioned whatever else it includes certainly embraces the ten qualities already mentioned as describing the ethical content of the image, and the means of transformation are objectively the beholding of Jesus Christ. How are men to behold him? The Apostle answers this question also. One way may be called literary, the other is personal. By the former is meant that Jesus may be seen clothed, as Calvin put it, in the garment of Scripture;[59] by the latter is meant the "living epistle," the fact that the faith filled life may be a means of beholding Christ. This thought has often been dwelt upon, but nowhere more impressively than in Browning's Saul:

---

[58] 2 Cor. iii.

[59] *Institutio,* III. II. 6 *Haec igitur vera est Christi cognitio, si eum qualis offertur a patre suscepimus, nempe evangelio suo vestitum: quia sicuti in scopum fidei nostrae ipse destinatus est, ita nonnisi praeeunte evangelio recta ad eum tendemus.* The entire beautiful passage should be read.

"Is Saul dead? In the depth of the vale make his tomb—bid arise
"A grey mountain of marble heaped foursquare, till, built to the skies
"Let it mark where the great first king slumbers; whose fame would ye know?
"Up above see the rock's naked face, where the record shall go
"In great characters cut by the scribe. Such was Saul, so he did;
"With the sages directing the work, by the populace child,—
"For not half, they'll affirm, is comprised there. Which fault to amend,
"In the grove with his kind grows the cedar, whereon they shall spend
"(See, in tablets 'tis level before them) their praise, and record
"With the gold of the graver, Saul's story,—the statesman's great word
"Side by side with the poet's sweet comment. The river's awave
"With smooth paper-reeds grazing each other when prophet-winds rave:
"So the pen gives unborn generations their due and their part
"In thy being!"

and again

"Each deed thou hast done
"Dies, revives, goes to work in the world; until e'en as the sun
"Looking down on the earth, though clouds spoil him, though tempests efface,
"Can find nothing his own deed produced not, must everywhere trace
"The results of his past summer-prime,—so, each ray of thy will,
"Every flash of thy passion and prowess, long over, shall thrill
"Thy whole people, the countless, with ardour, till they too give forth
"A like cheer to their sons, who, in turn, fill the South and the North
"With the radiance thy deed was the germ of . . ."

To complete the thought, however, we must bring in Paul's emphasis on the Holy Spirit who uses the Scripture word and the Christly life as means of producing the Christlike glory. It is not for us to command the Holy Spirit whenever we will, but it surely is our part to know the aim, to understand the nature, to use the means: that each individual within our reach may not be deprived of his most fundamental right, growth into the likeness of Jesus Christ.

George Johnson.

Lincoln University, Pa.

A STUDY IN THE ETHICS OF SHAKESPEARE

This little study in the ethics of Shakespeare is confined to the plays; the sonnets and other non-dramatic poems of Shakespeare being here left out of account. The materials of the study have for many years been before the mind of the writer, who has read the Shakespeare plays, some of them many times, and some of the commentaries on them, with intense interest, and has seemed to discover in the plays themselves clear and abundant evidence of an underlying and profoundly influential if not all-controlling ethic. The writer speaks as a Christian minister to brother ministers. The purpose in publishing the study is to call the attention of clergymen to these ethical materials, and if possible to stimulate an interest on their part in the ethical study of the greatest of English poets. It seems to the writer that clergymen as a class neglect to read and study in sufficient measure English literature of the first order, with a resultant defect of culture which entails on them in their pulpit utterances a distinct loss in elevation of thought and sentiment and in power of expression.

It seems *à priori* improbable that the great thinker (evidently great whoever he was) who wrote the Shakespearian plays should have had no general ethical conceptions which colored his view of the world and determined his interpretation of human life. And inspection of the plays, both in their plot solutions and in numerous separate utterances, seems to indicate that he had such conceptions, and that they largely, though probably with some exceptions, determined the ethics of his work. We may claim a general Shakespeare ethic without claiming that no exceptions to its application occur in the plays. The circumstances under which a play was produced might have interfered with its being developed and finished along characteristic ethical lines.

The influence of the source materials of the Shakespeare plays, the stories which he borrowed, should also be taken

into account. These materials may in some cases have seriously interfered with the manifestation of the poet's own ethic. Thus may be explained the ethically negative conclusion of *Troilus and Cressida*, apparently the only Shakespeare play that can be said to have an ethically negative conclusion, such a conclusion being probably determined, not by the poet's own ethic, but by the exigencies of the source materials.

The present writer has not investigated the ethics of these source stories, but suspects that they would be found to reflect the general human conviction that right-doing should be rewarded and wrong-doing punished, nay more, that the right conduct or the wrong conduct, the good character or the evil character, as the case may be, are the seed out of which the merited reward or punishment grows. This natural ethic is strongly in evidence in most of the Shakespeare plays. It is probable Shakespeare would as a rule select for dramatization stories whose ethics the human heart could approve. As a wise dramatist he would avoid outraging the ethical sentiments of his auditors. But surely there is little warrant for saying that the plays get their ethics from their sources. Rather their ethics, at least in most cases, and especially in the higher plays, are those of the great poet himself. And since we find him agreeing with the natural ethic just described, we may conclude that he heartily believes in and approves this ethic, and has made it vitally and profoundly his own. It is an ethic he shares with his principal sources (probably), and with the vast majority of humankind. It is a practically universal conviction of the human heart that wrong not only ought to be but ultimately is punished, and right rewarded. Shakespeare is not unique in holding this conviction; he is unique in the masterliness of his insight into and exposition of the moral principles to which this conviction bears witness.

Shakespeare, to be sure, was not primarily a moralist. His chief interest was dramatic. He expresses his dramatic

ideal as follows: . . . "the purpose of playing, whose end, both at the first and now, was and is, to hold, as 'twere, the mirror up to nature; to show virtue her own feature, scorn her own image and the very age and body of the time his form and pressure."[1] Later in the same paragraph he expresses the same thought by intimating that the end of playing is to imitate humanity. To hold the mirror up to nature, to imitate humanity, to portray life as it is, this is the dramatic aim and ideal of the great poet.

But human life is profoundly ethical. If then the dramatist is to imitate humanity he must take account of the ethical, indeed the ethical must color and condition all his work. And great Shakespeare could not fall short here. In expressing his dramatic aim, as just quoted, he singles out the ethical for special mention, and defines "holding the mirror up to nature" as "showing virtue her own feature, and scorn (i.e. vice) her own image." Thus he expressly declares that his portrayal of human life will take account of the ethical, and indeed aim to be as characteristically and profoundly ethical as life itself.

But just here we have to note that the poet's program includes the portrayal of vice as well as virtue, the showing forth of evil as well as good; for both are found in humanity, which he imitates. And this measure of realism calls for a word of explanation before we proceed with our theme. It is true that in the plays of Shakespeare, especially the early and inferior ones, there are coarse and vulgar scenes, with ribald jests and obscene passages. These may be viewed as bits of realism from an age which permitted greater frankness of speech than our own on some topics. Or they may now and then constitute a mere play to the footlights, in the interest of dramatization, to please the vulgar, and need to be practically disregarded by the ethical student, as blemishes which disfigure the otherwise noble work of the poet. But such elements, unattractive as they may seem, are not necessarily to be at once thrown aside as

[1] *Ham.* 3:2:19-22.

ethically valueless, or even as positively harmful. They are true to life, at least, and it may not be any disadvantage to the student of ethics to learn in this way something of the depths of depravity and meanness of which the human heart is capable. It can hardly be amiss for the clergyman to have such knowledge. The more he knows of human nature and human life the better, so long as the knowledge is acquired purely and without contaminating experience.[2]

But if we look closely we shall often find that the poet had some ethically useful end in view in these bits of crude realism. They may be designed to reveal in all its baseness the character or the motive of some person of the drama, and thus afford a valuable clue to correct character interpretation. Or the foulness or meanness of one character of the drama may be depicted in order to serve as a foil to set off and enhance the worthy quality of some other character; just as blackness serves to set off light. Indeed in such cases the sharpness of the contrast (as the vileness of Iago over against the heavenly purity of Desdemona) serves a double purpose, and the impression in both directions—the baseness of the base and the admirableness of the noble—is intensified. As a rule before he is through with his account the poet somehow contrives to give us the right ethical impression and dispose us to abhor what is false or mean, and to approve heartily what is upright or noble. The destiny of a character in a play will also frequently (but not always—see later) serve to indicate the ethical impression the poet would have us gather respecting that character. And thus revelations of evil in an unworthy character may serve to prepare us for and to explain

[2] This of course is not meant to imply the slightest approval of the depraved and pernicious type of "literature" which lacks all moral purpose, and in the name of "realism" revels in descriptions, often extravagant or one-sided descriptions, of the base and the vicious for their own sake only. Toward such incomplete or perverted and therefore ethically misleading "realism" (falsely called realism) the present writer's attitude is emphatically condemnatory, and is so expressed later in this study. In general the realism of Shakespeare's plays is not of this false and ethically harmful type.

the evil fate of such a character. Quite properly the poet consigns the evil character to an evil end. It is an ethical lesson worth learning, and one which our poet teaches emphatically, that meanness does not lead to honor nor sin to blessedness, but that

> by bad courses may be understood
> That their events can never fall out good.[3]

In the ethical study of Shakespeare much that is puzzling, and offensive, may be avoided by beginning with and largely confining the study to the later and nobler plays. In these plays, too, there is more to reward ethical study than in the less mature and less noble parts of the poet's work. The present writer would earnestly advise the tyro in Shakespeare ethical study to begin with and for a time confine his attention to such plays as *The Tempest, Macbeth, The Merchant of Venice, Hamlet, King Lear, Othello, Measure for Measure, Cymbeline, Julius Caesar,* etc., especially the first seven named. By taking these first he will at once get the best of Shakespeare ethically. Anyway, these seven, thoroughly studied, may be all the clergyman will have time for in his busy life. And if he never gets to the inferior plays it will not greatly matter—though to be sure they too contain materials of ethical value.

And now to proceed with our main theme. Men delight in a tale of ethical conflict, of clash and struggle between good and evil, with evil in the end vanquished and good triumphant. This keen and vital interest in things ethical indicates that the ethical is one of the deepest principles in human nature. It indicates too that normally men approve the good and condemn the evil, however inconsistent they may be about practising what they approve or eschewing what they condemn. Literary work which is ethically defective, which disparages good and panders to evil, can hardly hope to have an abiding hold on the attention of men. The perennial interest which Shakespeare commands indicates how near he is ethically to the heart of the

[3] *Rich. II,* 2:1:212-213.

race. In catching up the supreme principle of human life and embodying it in forms of beauty and power he has insured his own immortality. So long as men love justice and goodness, and abhor meanness and treachery, so long as they find pleasure in seeing wrong punished and right rewarded, they will read Shakespeare with delight. So long as the human heart remains what it is, Shakespeare will continue to sway that heart. For, consciously or unconsciously, he has made a correct ethic the regulative principle of his work, especially his maturer and nobler work.

In life however the ethical lies beneath the surface, and escapes the careless observer. Men feel it, rather than clearly apprehend it. So in Shakespeare's plays the ethical, though it permeates the work through and through, and determines the solution of the plots and the destiny of the characters, lies deep, and may escape the inattentive reader, who will see perchance only the march of gigantic passions or the play of wanton merriment, apparently unregulated by principle or law, as if to the poet life were only

> a tale
> Told by an idiot, full of sound and fury,
> Signifying nothing.[4]

But far otherwise. The poet has a profound ethical message for men. In the measure of his genius he

> utters wisdom from the central deep,
> And listening to the inner flow of things,
> Speaks to the age out of eternity.

That is, the poet correlates life with the eternal principles of life. Shakespeare is the world-poet for all ages. He has a profound ethical message for men. In his plays however this message is not organized or cast into systematic form. Like the elements of life itself, the life he portrays, it comes to us in the concrete. And this is the most effective form. We cannot read without feeling its power. It is warm and vital, a living and a potent thing. But to apprehend it more fully and definitely, we must abstract it and express it in

---

[4] *Macb.* 5:5:26-28.

scientific form. Only after open-eyed and sympathetic study can we come to appreciate the full sweep of the mighty ethic that lies at the basis of the nobler Shakespearian drama. To the clerical reader of Shakespeare this ethical study, properly directed, will prove highly profitable. He who thus studies Shakespeare is studying life, and may find the characters of the poet's creation incarnated in men and women of his acquaintance.

In this study the first point to receive attention should be the fundamental principle of the plays. The drama being a product of mind, it is gratuitous to question the existence of such a principle. Only on the assumption of some principle can we rationally account for the dramatic action. If there were no cause for the movement of the plot, the condition of things described at the beginning of the play might remain fixed and changeless. There is a motive in the mind of the dramatist. He has a definite goal to make.

The development of the dramatic situation cannot follow random lines, nor the destiny of the characters be arbitrary or fortuitous. Human history, human life, the onward march of man, are not the product of chance. They have their cause and their goal in the principles of the divine government, which ultimately rest on the attributes of God, and must at last attain realization in the life of his rational creatures. In faithfully reproducing human life Shakespeare necessarily bases all his work on these principles, which, inasmuch as they are the determining factor, the energizing element, that which drives the plot through to its solution, may be called the *dynamic* of the plays. Leaving now the closer definition of Shakespeare's relation to the divine moral government of the world for a later paragraph, it is in order to take up the principles spoken of and illustrate their nature and application from the plays.

The first of these principles is that of right and wrong, the law of retribution and reward, the eternal idea of *justice*. The dramatic situation in its higher forms is one of ethical conflict. Wrong has been done, the principles of the divine

moral order have been violated. The dramatic problem is to bring about a solution of this conflict, and to vindicate the moral order by restoring the perfect balance of right. The moral task which the dramatist sets himself is well stated in the words of Hamlet:

> *The time is out of joint;* oh cursed spite
> That ever I was born *to set it right!*[5]

This "setting right," a grim task from which the sensitive soul of Hamlet shrank, is ultimately universal in the moral government of God, and should therefore be universal in the drama which aims worthily to interpret human life. Poetic, i.e. ideal, justice directly or indirectly determines the destiny of the characters in Shakespeare. By the fate of the *personae* of his plays the great poet teaches that right-doing cannot go unrewarded, nor wrong-doing unpunished. Apparent exceptions—to be explained later—do not invalidate this conclusion.

Shakespeare's ethic then is that of the eighteenth chapter of the prophecy of Ezekiel: "The soul that sinneth, it shall die. The righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him."[6] Whatsoever the man sows, that does he also reap. The deed returns upon the doer. This principle, while everywhere apparent in the plays, is best seen in the Nemesis which overtakes evil doers in the great ideal tragedies. Here justice is undeflected, and the ethical problem is not complicated by the influence of other principles. All is direct, simple, and clear. The penalty is exact counterpart of the offense, the Nemesis is one of perfect equality, blow for blow is given, and "eye for eye, tooth for tooth" required.

In cases like these the evil that one has done is visited upon him in kind. In doing wrong to others he has established a precedent and asserted a principle which at last must be directed against himself. The law of his action, when

[5] *Ham.* 1:5:189-190.
[6] Ezek. xviii: 4, 20.

universalized, can allow him no exemption. As he has done, so must it be done unto him. This is the very essence of justice.

For example, Macbeth, in order to gain the crown, becomes a traitor to his king; but after he has become king his subjects, acting on the principle on which he has acted, become traitors to him, and "Minutely revolts upbraid his faithbreach."[7] And since Macbeth has murdered his king, now a subject of his own arises to slay him. "It will have blood, they say, blood will have blood."[8] "Now does he feel his secret murders sticking on his hands."[9] What more could he expect? His own lips, before he did the fatal deed, had announced the divine law, and in it the traitor's and the murderer's doom:

> If the assassination
> Could trammel up the consequence, and catch
> With his surcease success; that but this blow
> Might be the be-all and the end-all here,
> But here, upon this bank and shoal of time,
> We'd jump the life to come. But in such cases
> We still have judgment here; that we but teach
> Bloody instructions, which, being taught, return
> To plague the inventor; this even-handed justice
> Commends the ingredients of our poisoned chalice
> To our own lips.[10]

Thus the poet assures us that in this moral universe of ours, wherein reigns divinely appointed and inexorable law, the "consequence" of evil-doing cannot by any human power be "trammelled up," but is sure to come upon the offender, soon or late. One's deed is a *cause,* as certain as any cause to produce its appropriate effects. And these effects when they come will duly correspond to the deed that caused them, will therefore embody and express the quality of "even-handed justice," and will entail on the doer of evil his meed of ill, comparable to the ills his evil-doing

---

[7] *Macb.* 5:2:18.
[8] *Macb.* 3:4:122.
[9] *Macb.* 5:2:16, 17.
[10] *Macb.* 1:7:1-12.

entailed on others. What indeed could be more exactly just than that the poisoner's "poisoned chalice" should be pressed to his own lips?

One fails to see how any writer, least of all one of Shakespeare's genius, could have penned the words just quoted without being profoundly conscious of the ethical principle they so pointedly express, and intending indeed to give this principle concrete application in the fate assigned to the evil king in whose mouth the words are put. This king is made to say that by his very evil the evil-doer teaches men to treat him as he has treated others, and that one's deed of evil must be expected to return upon his own head. And this he recognizes as eminently fair and just, as *"even-handed* justice," because it renders to one the *equivalent* of his own deed. And truly equivalence is the essence of justice.

Notable Scripture instances of the application of this principle are found in the tragic career of Baasha,[11] and in the vengeance pronounced upon the house of Jehu.[12] These are not instances of capriciousness nor petty vengefulness, but of fundamental justice. It is the very essence of justice that one who has been or has posed as a minister of right, and then has shown himself to be an impenitent and unreformed evil-doer, should be called upon to suffer the very evil he has inflicted or sought to inflict upon others. This is a lesson men need to learn anew in these days when there is so much justice-contravening sentiment in favor of various classes of evil-doers. Wrong is wrong wherever found, and any but a nerveless righteousness (which is willing to pity the offender while forgetting his victims) will demand its fitting punishment. And what punishment can be more fitting, more exactly just, than that the evil-doer's deed be visited upon his own head? In line with this exact and "even-handed" justice we find the New Testament declaring that by divine power, indeed by God's own agency, those who afflict shall be afflicted,[13] those who destroy shall

[11] I Kings xvi. 7, 11-13.

[12] Hos. i. 4.

[13] II Thess. i. 6.

be destroyed,[14] those who smite shall be smitten,[15] the merciless shall receive judgment without mercy,[16] and "all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword."[17] On this last case we may remark that the phrase "*take* the sword" is a phrase descriptive of *aggressors,* and cannot be justly applied to those who necessarily resort to the sword in self-defense against aggression.

Returning to Shakespeare, it is to be observed that, while Macbeth becomes guilty by his attack on the innocent Duncan, no one incurs guilt in what he does to the guilty Macbeth; for the punishers of Macbeth act but as the agents of justice. The agent of justice never incurs guilt in inflicting punishment on the guilty. And in the case before us the punishment of Macbeth, by solving the dramatic conflict, ends the matter. Justice is satisfied, and moral harmony restored.

But in some cases the agent of justice does not preserve his innocence, but so implicates himself in the guilt of the situation that criminal and avenger must go down together. In *Hamlet* we have a beautiful instance of this twofold guiltiness, overtaken by a double Nemesis. Hamlet is the avenger of a father's murder. But by killing Polonius he becomes guilty of the murder of a father, and therefore liable to the very vengeance he himself is seeking to execute. That he is conscious of this is explicitly stated in his words,

> I am very sorry, good Horatio,
> That to Laertes I forgot myself;
> For by the very image of my cause
> I see the portraiture of his.[18]

So Laertes too becomes the avenger of a father's murder. But by entering into intrigue with Claudius, who is guilty of the murder of a father, and that Hamlet's father, he

[14] I Cor. iii. 17.
[15] Acts xxiii. 2, 3.
[16] Jas. ii. 13.
[17] Matt. xxvi. 52.
[18] *Ham.* 5:2:75.

identifies himself with the crime of Claudius, arrays himself against Hamlet the agent of justice, and so himself becomes guilty of a breach of justice and subject to the very law of vengeance he is seeking to execute on Hamlet. Now if that law is to be executed on one, it must under similar circumstances be executed on another. Real justice knows no partiality or favoritism. In the form in which Laertes espouses his cause he unconsciously condemns himself. And when he has been stricken down and must die his eyes are opened, and he freely owns that "the foul practise hath turned itself" on him, and that he is "justly killed with his own treachery."[19] Neither Hamlet nor Laertes preserved his innocence as an agent of justice; and both therefore became victims of justice. Each was naturally made the punisher of the other, for each was guilty of wrong to the other.

But since the king was the cause of their guilt they properly feel that all ultimately rests on him.

> Mine and my father's death come not on thee,
> Nor thine on me!

says the dying Laertes. "Heaven make thee free of it!" fervently responds the "noble Hamlet," and they "exchange forgiveness" before they die. As agents of justice however the young princes do their work before death falls on them. Laertes locates the guilt: "the king, the king's to blame"; and Hamlet strikes the avenging blow—"The point!—envenomed too! Then, venom, to thy work!" Claudius is "justly served" by falling victim to the very "poison tempered by himself."[20] All who became involved in the blood-guiltiness of the tragic situation are brought to a bloody end. Justice has its course, wrong is duly punished, and moral balance restored.

Before leaving *Hamlet* let us note that old Polonius is naturally brought to a bloody end, because he takes sides with the guilty king against Hamlet the agent of justice in

---

[19] *Ham.* 5:2:328, 318.

[20] *Ham.* 5:2:339.

the avenging of blood. Rosenkrantz also and Guilderstern, by entangling themselves in the criminality of the king, make themselves victims of the Nemesis of the play. In God's moral universe, it is a serious matter to take sides against, and interfere with the work of, the agent of justice, charged with the sacred task of vindicating the moral order and restoring the perfect balance of right. Laertes owned himself "justly killed with his own treachery"; and Hamlet's treacherous schoolfellows, who "did make love to this employment", are "put to sudden death, not shriving time allowed". "Their defeat does by their own insinuation grow".[21] By practising knavery on another they compel justice to make them the victims of knavery. Into the very trap they help set for Hamlet they themselves fall.

There's letters seal'd; and my two schoolfellows,—
Whom I will trust as I will adders fang'd—
They bear the mandate; they must sweep my way,
And marshal me to knavery. Let it work;
For 'tis the sport to have the engineer
Hoist with his own petard.[22]

A striking instance of "even-handed justice" is found in *King Lear,* that most symmetrical of Shakespeare's plays. The king turns out his daughter, and his daughter turns him out. So also of Gloster; he drives out his son, and his son drives out him. The person is not the same, but the relation is. Lear's natural safety lay in his loyal daughter, Gloster's in his lawful son. But each father, violating the bond of nature, drives away his only succor. These unnatural acts, however, are only the last of a series of wrongs which had their beginning long ago. In their first violation of right both Lear and Gloster sowed the seed which grew into a harvest of ruin for themselves. Each actually brings into being the agent of his own chastisement.

Is it the fashion that discarded fathers,
Should have thus little mercy on their flesh?
Judicious punishment! 'twas this flesh begot
Those pelican daughters.[23]

---

[21] *Ham.* 5:2:59, etc.
[22] *Ham.* 3:4:202-207.
[23] *King Lear,* 3:4:70-73.

The consequence of one's sin is the scourge that flays him. Thus Gloster by a breach of law begat the lawless son who was his bane.[24] The agent of his punishment was the creation and the natural product of his own misdeed. With him it was the irony of justice; he "stumbled when he saw",[25] so his sight was taken away. Well might the poor old man have cried, "The thorns which I have reaped are of the tree I planted." The great lesson of the *King Lear* is, not only that justice is visited upon wrong, but that wrong, simply by virtue of its being wrong, itself creates the agencies of its own inevitable punishment. Says Edgar to Edmund:

> The gods are just, and of our pleasant vices
> Make instruments to plague us;
> The dark and vicious place where thee he got
> Cost him his eyes.[26]

And Edmund replies:

> Thou has spoken right; 'tis true;
> The wheel has come full circle; I am here.

Thus the deed of wrong, completing its baleful cycle, returns upon the doer.

So of Lear's daughters; they are the bane of their father simply because he endowed them by heredity with his own imperious and arbitrary will, and all their life long by his example taught them to regard royalty as absolute and irresponsible. Even Cordelia derives from her father the unbending obstinacy of will which puts it out of her power to deal tactfully with a critical situation and thus prevent her own disastrous departure from his court. Her self-invoked rejection leads also to the banishment of Kent. So the old king strips himself of his real friends. A long series of arbitrary acts leads at last to the final fatal act. The habit of arbitrariness perverts judgment and leads the way to ruin.

> Absolute will disjoined
> From perfect mind is worse than weak.

---

24 *King Lear*, 1:2:1-5.
25 *King Lear*, 4:1:21.
26 *King Lear*, 5:3:170-173.

It is a sad but just doom for the parent to face his own faults in his children. In the person of his daughters Lear confronts and destroys himself.

Thus both Lear and Gloster began wrong and continued wrong until retribution was inevitable. "You cannot do wrong without suffering wrong." The universe is not a moral chaos. Its laws are infinitely just and infinitely powerful. Safety can never be found in violating them. Inasmuch as they subsist in the nature of things, they must in the end assert themselves. "Things bad begun" cannot "make strong themselves by ill";[27] for if this were possible the moral government of God would be defied and brought into contempt. This is suggested by the servants, in speaking of Cornwall and Regan, at the close of the third act:

> *2nd. Serv.* I'll never care what wickedness I do,
> If this man come to good.
> *3d. Serv.* If she live long,
> And in the end meet the old course of death,
> Women will all turn monsters.

But he does not come to good, nor does she meet the old course of death. Shakespeare is again true to the ideal ethic, to which he gives expression in the words of Albany at the end of the play:

> All friends shall taste
> The wages of their virtue, and all foes
> The cup of their deservings.

It is a temptation to cite here also the case of Othello, the Moor of Venice. But, since the question of Othello's guilt or innocence cannot be discussed adequately in this paper, it will be better to dismiss his case with only a few remarks. The fact that Othello nowhere confesses guilt does not necessarily prove him innocent. If he was guilty of the breach of family sanctity of which Iago suspected him[28] we could the more readily understand why he was so easily duped into doubting Desdemona's fidelity. It is easy for one who has sinned to doubt the innocence of others.

[27] *Macb.* 3:2:55.
[28] See *Oth.* 1:3:377-381.

If on the other hand Othello was innocent, his case but reflects the mystery of life, whereby the innocent sometimes become entangled by circumstances and go down in ruin—as indeed the innocent and "heavenly true" Desdemona does in this very play. But whether he was innocent or guilty makes no difference as regards the Shakespearian ethic. If guilty, he illustrates the sway of justice; if innocent, his case, like those of Desdemona, Ophelia, and other innocents overtaken by a tragic fate, is to be explained as is done a few pages later.

Many more illustrations of the law of justice might be adduced from the plays, but the above must suffice here. The principle is to be seen most clearly in the general movement of the plots, and single passages are of comparatively small force. But the following, in addition to those already cited, will prove suggestive, especially in their bearing on the question as to whether Shakespeare was conscious of the principle that underlies his work. The writer, for his part, in these utterances hears the poet expressing his own profoundest ethical convictions.

> *Hip.* I love not to see wretchedness o'ercharged,
> And duty in his service perishing.
> *The.* Why, gentle sweet, you shall see no such thing.[29]

> The whirligig of time brings in his revenges.[30]

> Let your fervor, like my master's, be
> Placed in contempt.[31]

> How ended she?
> *Cor.* With horror, madly dying, like her life,
> Which, being cruel to the world, concluded
> Most cruel to herself.[32]

> He forfeits his own blood that spills another.[33]

[29] *Mid-Sum. Night's Dream,* 5:1:85, 86.

[30] *Twelfth Night,* 5:1:363-4, cf. 355-6. Malvolio's conceit led to acts which the other servants could but desire to punish. See 1:5:75-83, and 5:1:360-375, especially 368-9.

[31] *Twelfth Night,* 1:5:270.

[32] *Cym.* 5:5:30-33.

[33] *Timon of Athens,* 3:5:88.

The house of Lancaster, having inflicted overthrow by unjust rebellion, at the hands of the Nemesis in human history justly suffers overthrow by rebellion.[34]

> Thou hast one son; for his sake pity me,
> Lest, in revenge thereof, sith God is just,
> He be as miserably slain as I.[35]

Also from the same play the following:

> And in thy need such comfort come to thee
> As now I reap at thy too cruel hand.[36]

> Yet heavens are just, and time suppresseth wrongs.[37]

> These graces challenge grace.[38]

> Never slept a quiet hour with thee,
> Now fills thy sleep with perturbations.[39]

> Bloody thou art, bloody will be thy end.[40]

> That high All-Seer that I have dallied with
> Hath turned my feigned prayer on my head,
> Hath given in earnest what I begged in jest.
> Thus doth he force the swords of wicked men
> To turn their own points in their masters bosoms;
> . . . . .
> Wrong hath but wrong, and blame the due of blame.[41]

> O God, what mischiefs work the wicked ones,
> Heaping confusion on their heads thereby!
> . . . . .
> And poise the cause in justice' equal scales,
> Whose beam stands sure, whose righteous cause prevails.[42]

---

[34] *Henry VI,* Part III, 1:1:131-142.

[35] *Henry VI,* Pt. III, 1:3:40-42, cf. 2:4:—, and 2:6:40-56, "Measure for measure must be answered." Also 2:6:74, "Thou pitiedst Rutland, I will pity thee," cf. 2:6:26, "I have deserved no pity."

[36] 1:4:165-166.

[37] *ibid.* 3:3:77.

[38] *ibid.* 4:8:48.

[39] *Richard III,* 5:3:160f.

[40] *ibid.* 4:4:194.

[41] *ibid.* 5:1:20-29.

[42] *Henry VI,* Part II, 2:1:186-205.

I told ye all,
When we first put this dangerous stone a-rolling,
'Twould fall upon ourselves.[43]

And appetite, an universal wolf,

. . .

Must make perforce an universal prey,
And last eat up himself.[44]

An Angelo for Claudio, death for death!
Haste still pays haste, and leisure answers leisure,
Like doth quit like, and measure still for measure.[45]

Riddling confession finds but riddling shrift.[46]

All's well, speaks of

the wrath
Of greatest justice.[47]

Sow'd cockle reap'd no corn;
And justice always whirls in equal measure.[48]

While this list is by no means exhaustive, the wide range of the citations made in the course of this paper will be noticed. It covers all classes of the plays. The title of one play gives expression to the ruling principle—*Measure for Measure*. To the writer it seems impossible that the poet should have been unconscious of the regulative influence of this principle on his work. Here it may be added that the conviction that there is a Nemesis of perfect equality, whereby "like doth quit like", and "measure for measure" is rendered, has taken crystallized form in the proverbs of all nations, a fact which witnesses to its practical universality. Consider our own "tit for tat", and equivalents. Also in the Sacred Scriptures this principle is iterated a hundred times over in such terms as this characteristic passage from the prophecy of Isaiah: "Woe to the wicked;

[43] *Henry VIII*, 5:3:104, cf. 113.
[44] *Tro. and Cres.* 1:3:116-124.
[45] *Meas. for Meas.*, 5:1:414-416.
[46] *Rom. and Jul.* 2:3:56.
[47] 3:4:28.
[48] *Love's Labor Lost*, 4:3:384.

it shall be ill with him; for what his hands have done shall be done unto him".[49] It is the curse and the horror of sin, not only that the sinner cannot feel that others are innocent where he is guilty, but that he must instinctively expect to suffer in the very way in which he has inflicted suffering upon others. The guilty one knows that by his own principle, which has been to do injury, he himself is justly liable to injury. The rule of life which he has followed with others must be applied to him. He has taught "bloody instructions", which will surely "return to plague the inventor".[50] He expects wrong where he has inflicted wrong. He is sure his sin will find him out. The principle of moral equivalence, like the law of cause and effect, innate in the human soul, haunts him. The guilty conscience finds no rest. "There is no peace to the wicked."[51]

Before defining more fully the nature of the drama characterized by the direct operation of justice it will be well to consider the deflections of justice, already alluded to, in Shakespeare. The first of these is for purposes of effect. Its principle is dramatic pathos. To gain perfect attention one must enlist the sympathies, and it may be stir the indignation, of his hearers. Taking advantage of this law, not designedly perhaps, but because he speaks from the heart to the heart, the skilled author makes use of the pathetic, in order to render his production the most interesting and effective possible. To the dramatist this principle is worth more than to any other writer, and by him is most freely used. And Shakespeare of course in this as in other points of soul-interpretation stands very high. No one else makes a more masterly use of the pathetic. It is scarcely needful to call attention to such striking instances as Desdemona, Cordelia, Ophelia, Juliet. These are all but perfectly innocent, their worst fault being some mistake, perchance, not meant for wrong. Why then is such a

---

[49] Is. iii. 11.

[50] *Macb.* 1:7:8-10.

[51] Is. xlviii. 22, lvii. 21.

cruel fate suffered to overtake them? Partly because of their connection with the guilty great, as Shakespeare explains:

> 'Tis dangerous when the baser nature comes
> Between the pass and fell incensed points
> Of mighty opposites.[52]

And "Let go thy hold when a great wheel rolls down a hill lest it break thy neck with following it".[53]

Also this:

> The cease of majesty
> Dies not alone, but like a gulf doth draw
> What's near it with it; it is a massy wheel,
> Fix'd on the summit of the highest mount,
> To whose huge spokes ten thousand lesser things
> Are mortis'd and adjoin'd; which, when it falls,
> Each small annexment, petty consequence,
> Attends the boisterous ruin.[54]

All this is true to life. The innocent become entangled and are dragged down with the guilty. No man suffers alone. Hence the grave responsibility of men in a position of natural or social leadership for the welfare of those who are bound up with them in the relations of life. Their sin may entail ruin on a multitude of others dependent on them.

Moreover it is also true to life that a mistake, however innocent, may have such causal bearing as to bring on the bitterest consequences. In the modern drama such instances are a relic of the Fate which was the ruling principle in the ancient Greek drama. The catastrophes "are the necessary outcome of circumstances too inflexible to be changed by human will." Such cases reflect the mystery of human life, a mystery which even Shakespeare's insight could not wholly penetrate. For his conviction that ideal justice is at last realized for all belonged to his faiths, not to his knowledge. He did not *see* justice done, but heartily believed it would be. To secure profoundest pathos, therefore, he had but faithfully to reproduce life. For, so viewed, life is pro-

---

[52] *Ham.* 5:2:60.
[53] *King Lear,* 2:4:66.
[54] *Ham.* 3:3:15-23.

foundly pathetic. Without this element the portrayal of life in the drama would be insipid. We need in the drama the mystery of unmerited pain. So innocent ones are delivered over by the poet to destruction for purposes of dramatic effect, to excite the sympathies and chain the attention of the spectator; and the rectification of this injustice is left to the future. Thus life as we with our limited vision see it is faithfully reproduced with all its mystery of unexplained suffering, a mystery that calls for another life for its solution.

In the ideal drama, however, such instances are a departure from the reigning principle, ideal justice. From the standpoint of the ideal ethic they are an anomaly, an imperfection, a positive error, which must be noted and allowed for in our ethical study of Shakespeare, if we are to arrive at other than misleading conclusions. It is to be remembered, too, that Shakespeare never utterly sacrifices the law of justice in the interests of dramatization. He approves the good, and leaves the impression that the good will at last be rewarded and the evil punished, though perchance not till in the life beyond the grave.[55]

The principle of dramatic effect also includes the purely humorous, which lies wholly *within* the sphere of the ethical, and is morally colorless, involving not an ethical but only an innocent social conflict. To be sure in Shakespeare's plays the ethical is almost always more or less involved, lying at the background of the social conflict. The *Comedy of Errors* seems to be without ethical implications, but is almost the only Shakespearian play of which this could be said. Apparently it in no feature involves an ethical, but only a social conflict. The relations and acts of the characters are not immoral, but only unmoral, i.e. are morally colorless, innocent. Yet even in this case the issue of the plot is inevitably, if remotely, determined by ethical considerations. Since no character is guilty of wrong, to have made the issue of the play other than a happy one would have been a

[55] Cf. *Ham.* 3:3:57-62 and other passages cited below.

flagrant violation of justice, so near the impossible that we never think of the principle as involved at all. So the comedy of situation has a real though a negative relation to the reigning principle, ideal justice. Shakespeare's fidelity to justice in his comedies is evident from the absence of violations of justice. Human nature would scarcely tolerate a drama in which innocence and virtue came to naught but sorrow, while dishonesty and vice were honored and rewarded. We all by the very force of our ethical nature

> love not to see wretchedness o'ercharged,
> And duty in his service perishing.[56]

And, so far as the Shakespearian drama is concerned, we "shall see no such thing."

The second deflection of justice is so important as to change the nature of the drama in which it occurs. Its principle is love, with forgiveness and moral restoration on condition of penitence. This does not annul or supersede justice, but modifies the action of justice in view of the guilty one's repentance and reformation. As previously remarked the drama in its nobler forms has to do with the moral conflicts which disturb the harmony of the ethical world-order. The dramatic problem is to solve these conflicts and effect a restoration of moral harmony. If justice takes its course the restoration will be effected by the removal (destruction) of the offender; but if, in consideration of the offender's repentance and reformation, justice is deflected by love the restoration will be effected by his reconciliation, that is, by his being brought again into harmony with the moral order of the world.

The fundamental principle of the ethical world-order—the moral government of God—is absolute justice. God, "the eternal power that makes for righteousness," administers the moral government of the universe in the interests of righteousness. Only in harmony with Him can man find rest. He is our moral environment, to which we

[56] *Mid-Sum. Night's Dream,* 5:1:85-86.

must make and maintain adaptation, or we shall experience moral destruction. The soul that persists in evildoing is doomed to be exiled and destroyed. Among good men he cannot permanently remain to vex and corrupt them. "Mercy but murders, pardoning those that kill".[57] And "Nothing imboldens sin so much as mercy".[58] For the sake of the good the moral order must be maintained. He who continues to be a moral leaper can be naught but an outcast in the moral universe of God. Such a one's ethical conflict is unmediated. Ethically his life is a tragedy. Like Claudius a man may go so far in evil that to him repentance and restoration become impossible:

> Try what repentance can; what can it not?
> Yet what can it, when one *cannot repent?*[59]

If justice be directly operative it gives us tragedy, the unmediated drama, whose ruling principle is that of the ethical world-order itself, ideal justice.

Can any then be saved? for "in the course of justice none of us should see salvation".[60] Yes, by the introduction of a new principle which deflects justice. Since salvation consists in a state of harmony with the moral order, all who can return to harmony with the world plan of God's moral government, and so with God himself, securing thus adaptation to their moral environment, can be saved. "If the wicked turn from the wickedness that he hath committed, and do that which is lawful and right, he shall surely live."[61]

> Who by repentance is not satisfied
> Is nor of heaven nor earth; for these are pleased.
> By penitence the Eternal's wrath's appeased.[62]

The high importance of repentance in Shakespeare, as in Scripture, results from the fact that it alone opens the way to moral restoration. Without repentance restoration is im-

---

[57] *Rom. and Jul.,* 3:1:194.
[58] *Tim. of Athens,* 3:5:3.
[59] *Ham.* 3:3:65-66.
[60] *Mer. of Venice,* 4:1:190.
[61] Ezek. xviii.. 21, 22.
[62] *Two Gen. of Verona,* 5:4:79-81.

possible. The *process* of return to moral harmony includes (1) a change of attitude (repentance), (2) a change of conduct (reformation of life), and (3) a change of character (progressive sanctification), all in the interest of ultimate complete conformity to the ethical standard of God's moral government—perfect righteousness. Only the first two however are prominent in Shakespeare, the third being tacitly assumed as necessarily implied by the other two. And these two are repentance and reformation—the "heart's sorrow and a clear life ensuing."[63]

Observe that in these cases justice is not disregarded, but the offender by his reformation arrays himself on the side of right and thus comes to stand in a new and correct relation to justice. Inasmuch however as full reparation for previous wrong conduct is beyond his power, he cannot perfectly satisfy the demands of ideal justice. Hence there is need for forgiveness, a thing which lies outside the functions of justice. So mercy must step in, the child of love, an entirely new and diverse principle. The frequency of appeal to mercy in Shakespeare is notable. When justice is thus deflected, we have comedy, the mediated drama, whose ruling principle is love.

Now, to recapitulate, in tragedy the presiding principle is ideal justice, the ethical conflict is unmediated, the offender perishes; in comedy the presiding principle is love, the conflict is mediated, the offender (in view of penitence) is restored and saved. In tragedy there is persistence in evil and increase of guilt; in comedy there is repentance and reformation. In tragedy ethical harmony is restored by removing the disturbing agent; in comedy by bringing him back to harmony. The key-word of tragedy is retribution; of comedy, reconciliation. Tragedy ends in the destruction of the guilty; comedy in their reformation and salvation.

These remarks indicate what from the ethical point of view is the most important distinction between tragedy and comedy. It is true that tragedy usually presents the more

[63] *The Tempest,* 3:3:81, 82, quoted below.

lofty and serious, comedy the lighter and more humorous, phases of character and life. But in correction of the popular notion that comedy is essentially comical it may be said that the amusing is merely an accident, not an essential, of comedy. There is as much of the laughable in *Hamlet* as in *The Tempest*. The tone of this latter play is serious and noble, though it is a "comedy". As Aristotle says, "the ludicrous is ever on the surface." The nature of comedy is determined by something that goes deeper. Comedy is essentially the drama that ends happily. Such is the Spanish drama of Calderon. So too Dante could properly entitle his great epic "The Divine *Comedy*", "because it has a fortunate ending."

The nature of comedy, as thus defined, might be illustrated by many examples from the plays of Shakespeare, but two or three illustrations must suffice here. In *The Merry Wives of Windsor* Falstaff's attack on the family is so grave that a tragedy might easily have been the issue; but the author meant the play to be a comedy, the conflict is therefore mediated, and the hoary rascal is thwarted, and put to ridicule and shame. In *Cymbeline* all characters except the queen and Cloten, who are impenitent and thoroughly bad, are forgiven and saved. In *The Tempest* Shakespeare's doctrine of forgiveness finds its highest expression. The spirit of this play as respects forgiveness is essentially Christian, as the following excerpts show. The first, in the words of Ariel, gives the ground of pardon:

> you three
> From Milan did supplant good Prospero,
> Exposed unto the sea, which hath requit it,
> Him and his innocent child; for which foul deed
> The powers, delaying, not forgetting, have
> Incensed the seas and shores, yea, all the creatures,
> Against your peace. Thee of thy son, Alonzo,
> They have bereft; and do pronounce by me:
> Lingering perdition, worse than any death
> Can be at once, shall step by step attend
> You and your ways; whose wraths to guard you from,
> Which here in this most desolate isle, else falls

> Upon your heads, is nothing but heart's sorrow
> And a clear life ensuing.[64]

Thus only penitence, followed by reformation, can secure forgiveness and salvation.

The second passage, in the words of Prospero, and all the more significant because not improbably Prospero is the impersonation of Shakespeare himself, expresses the moral feeling and spirit of the creator of this beautiful dramatic world:

> Though with their high wrongs I am struck to the quick,
> Yet with my nobler reason 'gainst my fury
> Do I take part; the rarer action is
> In virtue than in vengeance; they being penitent,
> The sole drift of my purpose doth extend
> Not a frown further.[65]

In Shakespeare's view the office of punishment is primarily corrective and reformatory. Even in comedy therefore it may for a time take its course, in order thus to bring men to repentance and salvation. Thus the "three men of sin," who exposed to the sea good Prospero and his innocent child, are chastised and brought to helplessness by the sea. "Destiny, that hath to instrument this lower world, and what is in't",[66] thus makes the means of crime the means of punishment. The sea, having been used by men in the commission of a crime, is used by justice in the punishment of that crime. But as long as there is hope of correction the punishment is only corrective, and not destructive. In comedy it can be corrective only; if destructive, the play becomes a tragedy. So in Shakespeare's world we find retributive justice proper only in the tragedies.

The mediating agent in the comedies is sometimes the Church, as in *Romeo and Juliet;* usually with beautiful appropriateness it is woman, as in *The Merchant of Venice;* in *The Tempest* it is the poet himself under the guise of Prospero.

Throughout this discussion the terms tragedy and com-

[64] *Tem.* 3:3:53-82.
[65] *Temp.* 5:1:25-30.
[66] *Temp.* 3:3:53-55.

edy have been used in their commonly accepted signification. For ethical purposes, however, since "comedy" is so readily taken to mean "light and amusing," another classification, which would more definitely suggest the moral tone of the respective plays, might be preferable. Since the issue of the plots in the plays is determined (directly or indirectly) by ethical principles, it would seem that for ends of ethical study the terms *mediated* and *unmediated,* as already defined, mark a good classification. Their use, as we shall see, can also be extended through the historical as well as the ideal plays. Where there is an intermingling of tones, with the destruction of a character or two in what is otherwise a comedy (as *Cymbeline*), yet if the plot is mainly mediated the play is to be classed as a mediated drama. In these cases the prevailing ethical tone is distinctly indicated by such expressions as "Pardon's the word to all."[67]

The historical plays of Shakespeare, and certain general aspects of our subject, are discussed in a subsequent article.

CHARLES A. MITCHELL.

Omaha, Neb.

(*To be continued*)

---

[67] *Cym.* 5:5:422.

The Dictionary of the Apostolic Church, Vol. II

This concluding volume of Dr. Hastings' *Dictionary of the Apostolic Church*[1] is the product of the labors of about a hundred scholars. Five of these are from the Continent, and a dozen are Americans. The material contributed by the Continental scholars is not large in amount nor of the first importance. P. Battifol write on Polycarp; E. von Dobschütz on Philo; H. Jordan on Writing; O. E. Moe on Moses; A. von Schlatter on Paraclete. The American writers are C. A. Beckwith, S. J. Case, J. A. Faulkner, W. M. Groton, K. Kohler (who, although a Jew, has been intrusted, among others, with so intimately Christian a subject as Shepherd), A. T. Robertson, G. L. Robinson, T. G. Soares, G. Vos, B. B. Warfield, and A. C. Zenos. Of these the largest contributions have been made by the late Professor Groton of the Episcopal Divinity School, Philadelphia, and Professor Case of the University of Chicago. Professor Groton writes the long (13 pages) and valuable article on "Mystery, Mysteries," which will serve admirably as a succinct introduction to the study of this obscure subject. Besides some shorter articles (Seed, Theudas, Tribute) Professor Case writes the long articles (17 pages in combination) on "Peter" and the "Epistles of Peter." The even longer article on "Paul," (21 pages) is written by Professor James Stalker, an old hand at the subject. Articles on such topics legitimately occupy large space in a Dictionary of the Apostolic Church. When we say Peter and Paul we almost say Apostolic Church—as the narrative of the Book of Acts may suggest to us. There are other long articles in the volume, however, the scope of which passes so far beyond the Apostolic Church as to set the reader to wondering as to the principle on which they have been admitted. There is for example, Professor James Moffatt's article on "War." It is an altogether admirable treatise on the attitude of the early

[1] *Dictionary of the Apostolic Church.* Edited by James Hastings, with the assistance of John A. Selbie, D.D., and John C. Lambert, D.D. Volume II: *Macedonia—Zion,* with Indexes. Royal 8vo; pp. xii, 724, double columns. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1918.

church to war. It quickly, however, gets beyond anything that can be called the Apostolic Church and does not stop till it reaches Augustine. And there is Principal Thomas Lewis' excellent article on Persecution. It finds no stopping place short of the Reformation.

It is the policy of this Dictionary to interpret the phrase "Apostolic Church" purely temporally. It means to it merely the Church of the first century. It is an incidental good result of this bad point of view that besides articles on the New Testament books we get admirable articles on what we may perhaps still speak of as Sub-Apostolic writings, and indeed on Jewish writings dating from a time somewhere about the Apostolic age. We have not only articles on Polycarp (P. Batiffol)—poor Papias is left out—and the Odes of Solomon (A. Mingana), but also articles on Philo (E. von Dobschütz), Sirach and Wisdom (D. S. Margoliouth), the Psalms of Solomon (G. B. Gray) and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs (A. L. Davies), and Sibylline Oracles (James Moffatt). It may no doubt be said that a knowledge of these writings is important, both as regards their language and their thought, for a complete understanding of the Apostolic age. Such a plea would be much more valid for the Jewish writings antedating the Apostolic times than for the sub-apostolic writings. There is really no good reason for included sub-apostolic writings in a Dictionary of the Apostolic Church. The gulf between the two groups of writings is as wide as that which divides any two groups of writings, contiguous in time, known to history. If we needed any proof of that, it would be supported by the result of attempting to smelt the two groups together in this Dictionary. For, if the excellence of the articles on the several sub-apostolic books tends to lead us to condone their intrusion into the Dictionary, the case is far different with the habit of tacking on to article after article on Apostolic teaching on this or that subject, a paragraph on the teaching of the sub-apostolic writers on it also. If this begins by being amusing, it ends by becoming wearisome. There is no section of the history of doctrine less exhilarating than that which deals with the sub-apostolic fathers. It was a true saying of a great man long ago that they would be better named sub-

apostolic babies. No matter how close they stand to one another in time, the Apostolic and the sub-apostolic writers cannot be compressed into the same category. The attempt to do so is a blunder.

Underlying the attempt to wash out the boundary line which separates between the Apostolic and sub-apostolic writings, and the consequent habit of speaking of the latter as "first century writers outside the New Testament," a low view of the inspiration and authority of the New Testament writings is usually discoverable, and in general a chariness with respect to the immediately supernatural in the origins of Christianity. Of course one would not require to look long before he found something of this sort among the hundred or so writers who have coöperated in the preparation of this volume. On the whole, however, even those whose personal views leave little place for an authoritative Scripture or for direct supernaturalism appear to have sought to write objectively. Professor A. R. Gordon, of McGill University, who writes the good article on "Scripture," seems to doubt whether the Christian can take the Old Testament, in its own sense, as authoritative to him, but he nevertheless tells us frankly that "the high Jewish theory of the inspiration of Scripture is fully accepted in the New Testament," where the words of Moses, David, Isaiah and the other prophets are "attributed directly to God" and are looked upon as the final norm alike of faith and of conduct. In the article "Miracles" by Bishop Maclean, we meet on the other hand with an attempt to explain miracles away, which was rather unexpected in this quarter. Many of the "miracles" recorded in the New Testament, we are told, are clearly not miracles in the strict sense; many which seemed miracles to those who witnessed them we can now see were not really miracles; many more, the natural mode of working which, that even we may not yet see, no doubt those who come after us will see. Perhaps "the theory of 'relative miracles' propounded by Schleiermacher" may commend itself to us. "This theory substitutes for a contravention of nature a miraculous knowledge. Certain persons had a greater hold upon the secrets of nature than their contemporaries." "But," it is added, "this was by a divine interposition"; and is not the

essential thing, as Dr. Sanday says, "the divine act?" What is troubling Bishop Maclean is the conception of nature as an absolutely closed system, in which everything that occurs must be the product of its own intrinsic forces operating normally; no intrusion from without is possible, or, at least, can be admitted to have ever occurred. Doubtless God made it; but having made it, He never afterwards has interfered with its mechanical working, for any purpose whatever. Whatever occurs is "natural." Of course Bishop Maclean seizes hold of that remark of Augustine's—which has frequently before been as gravely misused as he misuses it—that a "portent" happens not against nature but against "known nature." On the repeated occasions when he made this remark Augustine was not reducing our conception of miracles to merely "natural" events but elevating and enlarging our conception of "nature." There is a "nature" he says, above the nature spread out for our observation, the "nature," to wit, of the Divine Decree: for everything that God wills becomes by that act a natural thing to occur although it does not occur by means of the "natural" forces: it cannot be said to be "unnatural" though it be "supernatural," for the constitutive fact of all nature is the will of God. It is enough to dispose of Bishop Maclean's theory of "relative miracles" to ask what is the difference, on its basis, between a miracle and a trick, between the miracles of Moses before Pharaoh, say, and those of the Egyptian magicians? Despite his reduction of miracles to tricks, we observe, Bishop Maclean is concerned to show that the Apostolic age was marked by abounding miracles, while the post-apostolic age lacked them.

Perhaps the best way to obtain a fair conception of the quality of a book like this is to take some one general subject and observe how it is treated in its several parts by the various writers to which they have been committed. We choose the broad subject of Salvation for this purpose. There is a general article on "Salvation, Save, Saviour," by Principal Darwell Stone, of Pusey House, Oxford. It seems to be a fair example of what such an article should not be. It consists in the main of statistics of no great significance, and an analysis of Dr. Stone's own doctrine of salvation supported item by item by

proof texts bent to its service. It is certainly only a crotchet which denies that "save" in James v. 15 refers to bodily healing. On the other hand Professor A. T. Robertson of the Louisville Baptist Seminary gives us in the article "Mediation, Mediator" a refreshingly clear, straightforward and instructive account of the Apostolic teaching on the saving work of Christ. The skillful grammarian is always in evidence and the exact meaning of the sacred writings is sought and brought out with very telling effect.

A group of articles bearing on the expiatory work of Christ, —"Ransom," "Sacrifice," "Propitiation," "Reconciliation," has been committed to Professor Frederic Platt of the Wesleyan College at Birmingham. The short article on "Ransom" covers the ground fairly well, and reaches the eminently just conclusion expressed at the end, that by the employment of this term it is implied that "life in the highest sense" has been lost by man, and he "has no means of buying it back"; but "Christ has laid down his life as a price or means of redemption by which the forfeited possession was restored." The article on "Sacrifice" is much longer and more thorough, but is marred by its presupposition of the modern critical view of the composition of the Old Testament and the development of Old Testament religion, and by its estimating the whole Biblical material from this point of sight. A certain continuity in the development of the notion of sacrifice from the most primitive conceptions to that of developed Christianity is assumed. It is even supposed (p. 431) that traces of all the main theories of primitive sacrifice which have been broached by speculators may be discovered in the New Testament; and the necessity of choosing between them in our search for the original significance of sacrifice is avoided by the suggestion that all of them may have been held in those primitive ages the influence of which was still felt by the men of the New Testament. It is more reasonably declared, however, (p. 431) that "the one constant element in primitive sacrifice persisting to Apostolic times, that modern research, both anthropological and psychological, seems to warrant, is that sacrifice appears to have pleased the object of worship and secured the favor of deity—*i.e.* it was 'propitiatory' in the broad-

est sense." It is recognized that, at the time the Levitical system was formed, the "piacular or expiatory sacrifice" had become prominent. "It was the expiatory type that constituted the daily sacrifices—the continual burnt-offering—up to Apostolic times; it was regarded as most perfectly embodying, through its vicarious character, the sacrificial idea" (p. 402). That having been said, there seems no reason for the hesitation regarding the conception attributed to sacrifices in later Judaism, at least so far as the Judaism contemporary with the Apostles is concerned. It is allowed that Christ referred to His death as sacrificial; that "at a very early period," that is, in the Apostolic age, the death of Christ was regarded as expiatory; and that "this sacrificial interpretation of His death is imbedded in subsequent types of Apostolic teaching"—that Peter sharply asserts the vicarious nature of the sufferings of Christ, Paul "clearly regards the death of Christ as substitutionary," and the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Epistles of John make use of the same conception. Nevertheless there is some haggling over the question whether the Apostolic Church is to be said to have regarded Jesus' death as sacrificial or only to have employed sacrificial language illustratively of His death. We gain an impression that if the Scriptures were more definitely authoritative to Professor Platt his conclusions would possess a more decided character. The just decisiveness with which A. B. Bruce's suggestion is repelled (p. 434b), that Paul's ideas of Christ's sacrifice were colored more by the analogy of Greek and Roman human sacrifices than by that of the Levitical system, is the more welcome that more hospitality seems to be shown to this suggestion in the article on "Propitiation" (p. 283a). That article suffers from diffuseness and from an attempt to draw nice distinctions of somewhat doubtful validity. It insists, for example, that "the classical and pagan use of the Greek "term must not be carried over into the New Testament", with a vigor which can scarcely fail to seem excessive, when it emerges that "although such phrases as 'propitiating God' or God 'being propitiated' are foreign to Apostolic teaching, the Pauline view relates the propitiation to God as recipient" (p. 282a). To give any plausibility to the distinction, such exaggerated language requires to

be used as this: "The idea of directly appeasing one who is angry with a personal resentment against the offender—is foreign to biblical usage,"—which is of course true, but concerns less the usage of the word than the conception of the deity. The attempt to distinguish between the usages of Paul, "the Johannine writer," and the author of Hebrews is equally futile. The fact is that the usage of words of this stem in the New Testament is too meagre to supply a basis for such speculations. It does not make a pleasant impression when, after we have been told that the verb "propitiate" is construed in classical Greek regularly with the accusative of the person propitiated, it is added, "this construction is never used by the Apostolic writers." This can hardly be a significant fact when the verb occurs only twice in the New Testament. In the Septuagint it occurs in the banned construction and that with God as its object (Zech. vii. 2). Certainly the God of Christians is a different kind of person from the gods of the heathen, but we can never so "ethicize" the conception of propitiation as to rid it of the implication that it removes obstacles in Him (and not merely in us) to His favorable regard of us. That Professor Platt does not himself think that we can, we learn with more distinctness from the article on "Reconciliation." In it (p. 301b), he even uses such language as this: "God's anger is real; it is not simply official as the hostility of a law-giver in the presence of a law-breaker; it is personal, but not a fitful personal resentment . . ." He goes on to tell us, it is true, in quite modern fashion, that it is but the seamy side of love,—"love's crowning sign, not its contradiction,"—but this appears to be merely the repetition of a conventional mode of speaking and scarcely represents any very clear thought. We are glad to say that Professor Platt very decidedly represents the fundamental reconciliation wrought by the blood of Christ to have been the reconciliation of God. He feels bound to insist, however, strenuously and at length, that the transaction is mutual. This is not so plain as far as the direct Scriptural representations as to our Lord's "reconciling work" are concerned. If any are inclined to adduce the passive imperative of 2 Cor. v. 20 in this connection, they may profitably consult the passive imperative of Eph. v. 18. Professor Platt miscon-

strues the "in Christ" of 2 Cor. v. 19 after the fashion now so common, and founds some pretty theologizing on his misconstruction.

A large number of the elements that enter into the conception of Salvation come in for discussion in Professor James Moffatt's long and brilliant article on "Righteousness," chiefly of course from the point of view of Paul's teaching. Professor Moffatt touches nothing which he does not illuminate, and everyone will be his debtor for this searching and stimulating discussion. There are naturally some things he says, with which we should be compelled to take issue. We are thankful to be able to say, however, that with the larger part of the discussion we are heartily in agreement, and that we find many important truths enunciated in it in unwontedly sharp and telling language. This is the way in which at the opening of the section on the "technical Pauline use of the term God's righteousness" (p. 376) he sums up the content of the several passages which deal with that notion: "What is common to all is the presupposition, that this righteousness, this state of acceptance with God, this right relationship between the righteous God and sinful man, is brought about by God. It is not the goal of a laborious quest of man for God. The initiative is with Him. That is what the genitive signifies." We will not deny ourselves the pleasure of quoting further one or two crisply phrased truths. "Because the Christian is sure of final acquittal, he is to live up to it. Or to put it in an antithesis: he is not to be saved because he is good, he is to be good because he is justified" (p. 380b). "To be justified by faith was God's gift. But it was more than a gift; it was a vocation, a career—*Aufgabe* as well as *Gabe*" (p. 392a). Every reader of this article will find himself instructed.

We have already with Prof. Moffatt's article passed over from articles dealing with the procuring of salvation to those in which its application is expounded. At the head of these stands the late Professor T. Nichol's (of Aberdeen) excellent article on "Predestination." He is perhaps unduly exercised over the antimony between predestination and free will, and repeats the banal comment, now widely current, on the change in voice in Rom. ix. 22, and in his short article on

"Reprobation" he unhappily even enlarges on this matter. This comment only illustrates the straits in which those find themselves who would fain discover some hint in Scripture of a fundamental distinction in the nature of the Divine decree as it concerns the several classes of men. The article as a whole, however, is both well conceived and well worked out, and even with respect to the antinomy mentioned the right note is struck. "While St. Paul affirms the doctrine of absolute predestination to life, he asserts no less clearly the truth of human responsibility." That is the truth, accurately expressed. Professor W. F. Lofthouse, of the Wesleyan College, Birmingham, the author of the good article on the Freedom of the Will in the first volume of this Dictionary, writes here an article on the "Will" in the Apostolical writings which we find interesting rather than satisfactory. We shall not be easily persuaded to look on faith as "unswerving attention" (whatever may be the psychological effects which may be shown to result from sustained attention) rather than confident entrusting of ourselves to Christ. "If the attention is concentrated" on Jesus conceived as the Son of God, says Professor Lofthouse, expounding the notion of faith in 1 John, "the universe of evil around him is powerless to harm the Christian." We demur to this representation of the nature and working of faith even with reference to the teaching of 1 John, and much more with reference to its presentation in the New Testament at large. Professor Lofthouse is much occupied with the relation of God's will to man's in the processes of salvation. He sums up the matter very fairly. Man's will, he says, "acts properly only when it is roused and directed by Divine grace. The necessity for its exercise will never be superseded; but the more it is exercised under Divine control, the more it becomes God's will in man, and the more it becomes man's own will, acting at last in complete freedom" (p. 680b). But he is disturbed about the initial act of salvation. "Man's will appears to be called for," he says, "by such passages as 2 Cor. v. 20, 'Be ye reconciled to God', but against them Rom. ix. 18 may be quoted . . ." If we are to be saved by grace, he argues, we are also to be saved through faith; and if the one might lead us to suppose we are to be merely passive in salvation, the lat-

ter "shows that this is very far from being the case." We must mind, however, our prepositions—"by" and "through" convey the notification of different and not inconsistent relations; and with respect to passivity and activity, we must distinguish times—a famous old formula speaks accurately, regarding the initiation of salvation, of man being "altogether passive therein until—." We have already pointed out how easily the passive imperative in 2 Cor. v. 20 is misunderstood. We are not exhorted there to lay aside our enmity to God, and even less to secure from God the laying aside of His enmity to us. The means by which God is reconciled to men is not their faith but the blood of Christ. We need not wonder that we find it difficult to express the passive imperative with accurate simplicity in translation. A phrase like this (Eph. v. 18): "Be ye filled in the Spirit," requires paraphrasing. Professor Lofthouse writes also the article on "Repentance." It is a distinctly disappointing article. It is written under the influence of preconceptions which the Biblical statements, conceived as they are only as references to the subject by early preachers, have no power to dispel. The rich literature on the subject is almost entirely passed by in the appended Literature.

According to Professor D. S. Adam of Melbourne, who writes on "Union with God," salvation consists essentially in the complete expression of the Divine Logos in man, who, as made in the image of God, furnishes "a form of being capable of expressing the Divine Logos in fulness of measure," and by his sin only conditioning the nature "of the task which the perfect Son of man and Son of God, when He appeared on earth, had to undertake." He is very careful not to commit the Apostolic writers to the doctrine of the Trinity, and is equally careful to commit them to such doctrines as the institution of "a certain metaphysical union between man and God by virtue of creation"; the necessity of the incarnation independently of sin; and the redemption of man through the union of the Logos with him in the incarnation. We are in a different atmosphere in Professor T. G. Soares' (of Chicago University) article on "Regeneration." He seeks to throw the New Testament doctrine up against a background supplied by Jewish Apocalypticism and the heathen mystery religions. But he is very much

afraid of sacramentalistic and magical conceptions slipping in; and labors so hard to "ethicize" the notion as to go far towards desupernaturalizing it. He gets the cart before the horse in his interpretation of such passages as 1 John v. 1, iv. 7, ii. 29, in which, in John's meaning, the begetting from God is not the effect but the cause of faith, love, righteousness. The reader is confused by a repeated odd use of the word "status" as if it expressed nature rather than relation. An appearance is created as if Professor Soares' conception of regeneration vibrated between that of justification and that more commonly connected with the term regeneration, and as if he may perhaps wish to wipe out this distinction. The article on "Sanctification" (as also that on "Saints") is written by Mr. Robert H. Strachan, Minister of the Presbyterian Church at Cambridge. Sanctify, sanctification are to him terms of relation, not of condition, much less of process. Holy really means sacred, and to sanctify means to make sacred, and sanctification the state of having been made sacred. As this is a thing God does, it is done absolutely and all at once. "Our moral progress is not a growth into holiness out of a state of comparative unholiness. That would be to negative the Christian gospel. Rather it is a growth *in* holiness. The act that makes us holy is done once and for all." In itself, therefore, sanctification has nothing to do with ethical conduct. It means merely that we belong to God. But as the God we belong to is an ethical Being, belonging to Him involves ethical conduct on our part. Sanctification thus necessitates ethical conduct and this conduct may be progressively ethical. The standard of this ethical conduct, is not, however, "statutory" law, but the Christ within us. The ethics of the saints is autonomous; precisely what they are as saints is freemen in Christ Jesus. "All legal statutes are out of place in the Christian life." Even the teaching and example of Christ are subject to our critical scrutiny. "This is dangerous doctrine," says Mr. Strachan himself. But he comforts himself by adding: "All great doctrines are dangerous." At another point he quotes Paul's declaration that the law is good and holy and righteous. This, he says, however, illustrates only one side of Paul's teaching; it has reference only to those whose walk as saints has only begun—to babes in Christ. "Obe-

dience to law is good for those to whom God says only 'Thou shalt' or 'Thou shalt not' . . . For the Christian, for 'those who are sanctified,' the 'law' of sin and death is done away altogether, and obedience to the law of God is merged in a higher and nobler loyalty to the God and Father of Jesus Christ, and above all in a sense of supreme indebtedness." It is true, of course, that the Christian has a more constraining motive to "conformity with God" than even the commands of God's holy law; and it is true also, of course, that the recreating Spirit is by His recreation of him writing the law of God on his heart, so that he becomes more and more a law to himself: but the law of God must remain ever his standard, and the words of Christ must be always valid, that not one jot or one tittle of it shall pass away until all of them are accomplished. It would be harsh to speak of Mr. Strachan's teaching as antinomian—but that way antinomianism lies.

The article "Perfect, Perfection" by Principal J. G. Tasker of the Wesleyan College, Birmingham, confines itself to tracing the usage of the words in the New Testament. This it does very interestingly. The article on "Perseverance" by Mr. A. S. Martin of Aberdeen on the other hand enters fully into the subject and gives it a treatment which is excellent in conception and eloquent in presentation. The paragraph near the beginning on the antinomy of preservation and perseverance, —or, as Mr. Martin phrases it, of the religious and the moral aspects of the matter—is especially finely worked out. "The more dependent the spiritual sense," he says, "the more intense the moral independence." It is a good saying when we are told later that to the religious man, "any attempt to claim for man ability or sufficiency," "must appear as nothing less than 'religious illiteracy'." And it is an equally good saying when we are told that the Christian *agonistes* is "slack in no element of its manifold nature" but throws all that he has and is into the good fight. There is a little wavering at the end as to the relation of God and man in the work. God has the initiative in salvation. But "He waits on the start of our effort." This, it appears, is because "our effort is the beginning of His gift, the first stirring of 'the grace that is in us' from Him and which can become ours in no other way." "And so," it is

added, "after the start, throughout the whole of our moral growth, every new stirring in us is of our effort *and* of His gift and increase (Phil. ii. 12). We are never from first to last simply quietistic receivers of something infused." The statement is not free from ambiguity and does not carry its broad meaning with certainty. But it awakens a fear that its spiritual affiliation may be with Erasmus, rather than with Luther—and Paul. Every saving work of God actifies the soul, but no saving work of God waits on the soul's activities.

We shall not follow the treatment of the elements of salvation into the eschatological field. There are important articles on topics which fall in this region, which invite remark—articles for example on "Resurrection," "Parousia," "Paradise," "New Jerusalem." We have already occupied, however, as much space as is at our disposal. And perhaps enough has already been said to convey a fair conception of the character of the discussions which fill the volume.

Princeton. BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD.

REVIEWS OF

RECENT LITERATURE

APOLOGETICAL THEOLOGY

Why Christianity did not prevent the War. By Isaac J. Lansing, D.D., 8vo; pp. 251. New York: George H. Doran Company. 1918.

We have here nine "occasional addresses" on the general subject of The War. "They were given to Preachers' Meetings in New York, and to various clubs; among them the Rotary Club, the New York Republican Club, and the Lawyers' Club of New York." They were also delivered to the public school teachers of Chicago and to other popular assemblies.

The titles of the addresses are as follows: I. "Why Christianity did not prevent the War"; II. "The Antagonism of German Political Philosophy to Christian Truth and Morals"; III. "The Angels' Song as they said it"; IV. The Doctrine of Jesus about Resistance to Evil"; V. "The Perils of a Premature Peace"; VI. "The Wisdom of Men that was Foolishness with God"; VII. "Spiritual Aims and Gains of the Nation"; VIII. "Prohibition and National Defence"; IX. "Our Victory Assured."

These addresses are distinctly above the ordinary; and we are not surprised that "everywhere they were called for in printed form and it was urged that so prepared they could multiply their influence for good." Some of these addresses, specially that on the "Perils of a Premature Peace", have a pertinence beyond that of the time of the first delivery. We wish that all who would have a peace settlement on any other basis than one of strict justice would read and ponder Dr. Lansing's true and ringing paragraphs. His discussion also of the relation of German political philosophy and of German biblical criticism to the War is timely and easily intelligible. Indeed, our author aims to be and is preëminently popular; and for this reason two or three criticisms of minor and unessential points, which might be called for in a scientific treatise, need not be made.

Princeton. William Brenton Greene, Jr.

What is this Spiritualism? By Horace Leaf. 8vo; pp. 185. New York: George H. Doran Company. 1919.

The purpose of this book is to popularize spiritualism by explaining and commending it to the man on the street. This, however, it must fail to do. The style is too heavy to attract and the information too confused to enlighten. The impression made will be almost sure to be, that the evidence presented is largely uncriticized and inconsequential; that what has been established, if, indeed, anything has been established, as to the future life, is trivial and unsatisfying; and that all the

intimations that might be considered important as to the nature of existence beyond the grave contradict the teaching of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ and the divinely guided apostles.

One value, therefore, this volume certainly will have, it will help to define the issue, and this will be great gain. Lodge or Christ—which shall we believe? If we believe the one, we must deny the other. We cannot follow both. This, without intending to do so, our author has made clear; and we thank him for the real service which he has thus rendered.

Altruism, Its Nature and Varieties. The Ely Lectures for 1917-18. By George Herbert Palmer. 8vo; pp. viii, 138. Charles Scribner's Sons: New York. 1919.

"The general subject" of these lectures, as the author himself says, "might be entitled The Forms and Stages of the Conjunct Self." By the conjunct self he means "the person constituted through relations"; that is, what we might call the social self. This self, the real concrete self, he exhibits in its "protective, generous and identifying impulses as successively different aspects of the altruistic life." Thus, under the heads of "Manners", "Gifts", and "Mutuality", he traces the development of the self from egoism up to selective love which would sink and find itself in the loved one, and then to "justicial love", or "publicmindedness", which, as "impartial love", would love all according to their claims. In this "extended and superpersonal love," altruism attains its fullest and steadiest expression. But so does egoism, too.

Such is the doctrine of this book. In it there is nothing new. We have long known, that egoism and altruism are indispensable the one to their clims. In this "extended and superpersonal love", altruism ing to give to others; that, on the other hand, our own welfare waits on the welfare of others.

But while there may be nothing new in the general idea and aims of these lectures, there is much that is new in the way of suggestion and of application, ond of the highest value also. So true is this that one declines where all is excellent to look for the best. Suffice it to say that, in the judgment of the reviewer, there is not a paragraph that could be dispensed with. Nor is the style less clear and vigorous than the thought. This was to be expected from Prof. Palmer, as all familiar with his writing will allow; but in these Ely Lectures he would seem to have surpassed even himself. It would be difficult to say whether he is more convincing than fascinating or more fascinating than convincing. Probably it would be nearest the truth to say that he is most fascinating because he is so convincing.

In one respect, however, he has failed to convince the reviewer. Not that the latter believes his position to be erroneous, but only his form of statement to be misleading. His position is that to be ideal, love must be just. What he says is that love and justice are the same. Justice is justicial love. Now this we may not admit. Justice cannot properly be merged into benevolence. Fundamental to it, it is distinct

from it. Such is the testimony of every man's consciousness. Such would be the testimony of Prof. Palmer's consciousness—shall we suggest it?—if he were not for the time being listening to the philosophic demand for unity.

But enough. The reviewer would not indulge even in the kindliest criticism. His great concern is to get the book read. He regards it as specially pertinent to our day. "Altruism and egoism, socialism and individualism, are in our time sentimentally arranged against one another as independent and antagonistic agencies each having its partisans." "We need to be shown that the one has meaning only when in company with its supposed rival, and that the perfection of man and of society involves the equal development of both the ego and 'the conjunct self'."

Princeton. WILLIAM BRENTON GREENE, JR.

Man and the New Democracy. By WILLIAM A. MCKEEVER, Ph.D., LL.D., University of Kansas, Author of "Training the Boy", "Training the Girl", "Psychology and Higher Life", "Farm Boys and Girls", etc., etc. 8vo; pp. 250. New York: George H. Doran Company. 1919.

We have here an earnest plea for the application of psychology to the education of the "common" child. Thus and only thus, the author contends, can the new democracy that is bound to succeed "the war" be made safe for the world or the world be made safe for the new democracy. Dr. McKeever says many sensible things that all know and some sensible things that all do not know. He seems to the reviewer, however, to exaggerate the power of education and to have no conception of regeneration; to nullify religion by making one religion as good as another; and while rightly insisting on the importance of the "common" child, to do serious injustice to the uncommon child with whom now and then God blesses us.

Christianity and Mormonism. By T. G. SMITH, D.D. 8vo; pp. 16. The Westminster Press: Philadelphia, Pa. 1918.

A temperate, yet, in spite of that and even because of it, just and most scathing indictment of Mormonism.

Jesus—Our Standard. By HERMAN HARRELL HORNE, PH.D. (Harv.), Professor of the History of Education and the History of Philosophy, New York University. 8vo., pp. 307. The Abingdon Press: New York and Cincinnati. 1918. Net, $1.25.

This is not a life of Jesus, nor a philosophy of Jesus, nor a theological interpretation of Jesus, nor a criticism of the Gospels. It is "a portrayal of Jesus as the ideal standard of human character and achievement." Professor Horne in this study applies various tests—physical, intellectual, emotional, and spiritual. The reactions are the best. "Jesus *is* standard", the universal man, in each line and along all lines our model and example. Such are the aim and the argument of

this in many respects admirable work. It would help us to "see Jesus" that we may "follow him."

Nevertheless, we are constrained to take exception to this well intentioned, well planned, and well carried out discussion in at least three important respects:

1. Its psychology. It takes the voluntaristic viewpoint throughout. "Activity is the primary principle, emotions are the psychic side of instincts in action, and ideas follow acts and feelings, as well as guide succeeding acts and produce other feelings." Yet how can this be? Can we feel that of which we are not aware? Can we resolve to do that of which we have no feeling or idea? Must not cognition, then, be primary? Is not this the conception of the Gospels themselves? It is on our Lord's teaching that they put the emphasis. They would have us follow him because of what he is, and they would have us estimate him through what he says. They would have us appreciate him, not in the light of our feelings and intentions with regard to him, but in the light of his own doctrine of his person. This will appear more clearly when we consider:

2. The Christology of our author. This is radically and positively false, and it is so because it is a human evolution rather than a divine revelation. It makes Jesus the norm of humanity, but this is because he has been identified with ideal humanity (p. 45). It regards Jesus as divine not because he is, as he himself said, "one with the Father" (John x:20), but because humanity, of which he is the highest attainment, is essentially divine. Very different, then, is Prof. Horne's position from that of Horace Bushnell in the famous tenth chapter of his "Nature and the Supernatural." The former pronounces Christ divine because on analysis he has found him to be the most human of men. The latter concludes his superb study of our Lord's character with the exclamation, "How far is he now from any possible classification in the genus humanum!" And the difference is as practical as it is great and striking. It is just because Christ is "very God of very God" as well as "bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh" that he is fitted to be our standard. A standard, to be such, must be obligatory; and to get the obligatory, we must go to Deity. In the last analysis only God can bind.

3. Even more erroneous is our author's theology. He conceives of God as willing and able to forgive sin on the ground of repentance and reformation. There is nothing in him which demands a satisfaction to justice. The cross is ignored, and it is ignored because it is unnecessary. This is not explicitly stated, but this is the natural inference. The impression made, and made almost irresistibly, is that salvation is by character. Realize the standard, and that will be enough. This is why the standard is so elaborately presented. But this is not enough. "By the works of the law shall no flesh be justified in God's sight" (Rom. iii:20). The reason is clear. By nature "dead through trespasses and sins" (Eph. ii:1), no one of us is in himself able to imitate our standard in Christ; and because we are by nature "children of

wrath" (Eph. ii:3) in consequence of our guilt, even Christ may not help us until, because of satisfaction rendered for our guilt, it becomes right for him to do so. Hence, it is through faith, and only through faith, in Christ as our sacrifice as well as our standard that we must be saved; and it is because the latter is emphasized to the apparent exclusion of the former that Professor Horne's book seems to us an unsafe one, especially if it be intended, as it is, for Y. M. C. A. secretaries and workers. They already show a general and dangerous tendency to minimize the cross, and in so doing to hide that which is most characteristic of the standard which they would exalt; for "the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister and to give his life a ransom for many" (Mark x. 45).

Princeton. WILLIAM BRENTON GREENE, JR.

National Sentiment and Patriotism in the New Testament. By GEORGINA B. BUCKLER. Gibson Prize Essay. 1916. 8vo., pp. 43. Cambridge: Deighton Bell & Co., Limited. London: G. Bell & Sons, Limited. 1917.

A scholarly and exhaustive study. After defining Patriotism as "national sentiment", our author presents it as it appears in New Testament days in the case of Proselytes of the Covenant, Proselytes of the Gate, and Pagans. She emphasizes the liberal treatment of the Jews by foreign masters, and, in opposition to this, the racial and religious intolerance of the Jews themselves. She traces the growth of the national spirit in Jewish history and shows how it culminated in the Messianic hope and how this became the occasion for the excesses of the Zealots. Then, having thus developed the background and the environment of our Lord and his Apostles, she proceeds, in contrast with these, to set forth (1) his attitude, and (2) theirs, toward patriotism. This she finds to be that, "as far as the writers and actors of the New Testament are Christian, so far are they international rather than national, cosmopolitan rather than patriotic" (p. 42). Is not this conclusion, however, though justified apparently by citations, in itself misleading? Our Lord wept over the foreseen destruction of Jerusalem, (Matt. xxiii:37). Was this "national sentiment" unchristian? Paul could wish himself anathema from Christ for his brethren's sake, his kinsmen according to the flesh (Rom. ix:3). This was patriotism rather than cosmopolitanism, but was it unchristian? Was not the fact just this, that our Lord and his Apostles were intensely patriotic, but that their patriotism, so far from conflicting with, in a way realized, their internationalism and cosmopolitanism? He came to die for his own "nation; and not for that nation only, but that he might also gather together into one the children of God that are scattered abroad" (St. John xi:52). In a sense he was neither a patriot nor a cosmopolitan. His conception was spiritual. That, however, did not keep him from being really both a patriot and a cosmopolitan. Because a man respects all women as women and because women, that does not prevent him from loving his own wife supremely.

Unless he does so, his respect for the feminine sex will be worthless and even insulting.

Democracy and the Church. By F. A. AGAR, Author of "Dead or Alive", "Help Those Women", etc. 12mo., pp. 91. Fleming H. Revell Company: New York, Chicago, London, Edinburgh. 1919.

With the controlling principle of this little book, "that only the religion of Jesus Christ incorporated with the principles of democratic government can make democracy safe for the world", we find ourselves in heartiest accord.

From the other main principle, that "the church is the ideal democracy", we must as heartily dissent. As Dr. Charles Hodge teaches, the church is not a democracy, nor an aristocracy, but truly a kingdom of which Christ is absolute sovereign (Sys. Theo. Vol. II, p. 608). To go on further, he is "the head of the church", not because its members have, as in a democracy, chosen him to be such, but because he is such in virtue of his deity and because all power and authority have been committeed unto him as Mediator, both in heaven and in earth: and so far from making her own laws, as in a democracy, the church has no legislative function; she may only interpret "the Word" of her King.

Princeton. WILLIAM BRENTON GREENE, JR.

The War and the Bible. By H. G. ENELOW, D.D., Temple Emanu-El. New York. 12mo. pp. 115. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1918.

To say that Dr. Enelow has given us a gracefully written and an attractive book is well within the truth and only what might have been expected from him. To say that he has presented correctly and adequately the Old Testament's conception of war would also be only the fact. In nine chapters entitled "The Spiritual Problems of the War", "The Attitude of the Bible Toward War", "The Ethics of War in the Bible", "Some Great Wars of the Bible", "Heroes of War in the Bible", "The War Poetry of the Bible", "War Prayers in the Bible", "Parallels to the War in the Bible", and "The Peace Ideal of the Bible", our author has set forth admirably the Old Testament's doctrine of war and of peace and the application of this teaching to present conditions. To put forth the discussion thus outlined, however, under the title of "The War and the Bible", which is what is done—this is utterly misleading. The Bible embraces the New Testament as well as the Old Testament, but the book under review virtually ignores the New Testament. In the Bible the New Testament is the more important as that up to which the Old Testament leads, for which it prepares, and in which it finds its explanation; but Dr. Enelow gives just one and a quarter of his little pages (p. 21) to the New Testament position on War. Of the Bible, and in the Old Testament equally with the New Testament, Christ is the great subject; but in "The War and the Bible" Christ is even referred to not once. We might suppose that

the position of Christ with regard to war would be the great, in a sense the all-absorbing question in such a book as "The War and the Bible." We might expect that topics such as our Lord's alleged "doctrine of non-resistance" (St. Matt. v:39) would receive extended and careful treatment. So such Christian writers as the Rev. George Holley Gilbert, Ph.D., D.D., whose excellent work on "The Bible and Universal Peace" was reviewed in our issue for April 1918, have thought, and so they have written. Why, then, has our author not thought and done the same? Because he is a Jewish and not a Christian writer? That would explain his indifference or his hostility to Christ as the false Messiah. It might even account for his treating him as he has, that is, as a negligible quantity. What it would neither justify nor explain would be, that his book with a title which, as we have seen, must be misleading to the Christian and, indeed, to the general public, is being systematically and diligently distributed; that a "Jewish Overture to Christian Clergymen" to forward their names for free copies has been sent out; and that the overture is signed and endorsed by three prominent evangelical ministers. Have we not in all this only the most recent illustration of the organized effort against which the Rev. S. H. Kellogg, D.D., warned us in a learned and able article in the Presbyterian and Reformed Review as long ago as 1890—the effort to undeify and so to dethrone our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ?

Princeton. WILLIAM BRENTON GREENE, JR.

SYSTEMATICAL THEOLOGY

The Faith by Which We Live. A Plain, Practical Exposition of the Religion of the Incarnate Lord. By the RIGHT REVEREND CHARLES FISKE, D.D., LL.D., Bishop Coadjutor of Central New York. Morehouse Publishing Co.: Milwaukee, Wis. 1919. Pp. 322.

This volume is a popular exposition of Christian doctrine from the standpoint of a high Churchman.

When expounding the Christian conception of God, the Trinity, and the Incarnation and Person of Christ, Bishop Fiske adheres to the historic position of the entire Christian Church.

In dealing with the doctrines of the way of salvation and of the Church and Sacraments, Bishop Fiske takes the position of a high Anglican. The presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper is not only real, but really in the elements, and though it is said to be not material but spiritual, yet the body and blood of Christ are affirmed to be present, while the philosophy of transubstitution is rejected. The doctrines of confession and absolution, and of Apostolic succession are likewise defended after the fashion characteristic of the high Anglican.

In this doctrine of Scripture Bishop Fiske departs from the teaching of the entire Christian Church, asserting a conception of Revelation which mediates between a thoroughly naturalistic view and the high supernaturalism of the Biblical idea, and also a doctrine of "personal"

Inspiration which claims that the authors of Scriptures are inspired, but not their writings.

Also in his conception of the Atonement, Bishop Fiske departs from the doctrine of the whole Christian Church, and appears to vacillate between the moral influence and rectoral views.

Reunion in Eternity. By W. ROBERTSON NICOLL. New York: George H. Doran Co. 1919. Pp. 295.

This book is divided into two parts. The first part contains a number of essays on the subject of the reunion of friends and loved ones in the future life. The treatment of the subject is not systematic, nor is there intended to be any special progress of thought from one essay to another, or in the ordering of them. Each essay, moreover, is complete in itself. The first, for example, shows that it is Christ who has brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel. The second cites examples to show that some who are not Christians have cherished the hope of reunion in the future life. Still another essay states one of the grounds of hope in such reunion, while another sets forth the nature of the future state. Two other essays deal respectively with the topics of "Renunciation and Reunion" and "Between Bereavement and Reunion"; and part one closes with quotations on the subject of reunion of souls in the future state from Tennyson, Dante, Luther, and Melanchthon.

Dr. Nicoll's main conclusions, as he himself sums them up in the Preface, are that believers at death pass into the immediate presence of Christ; that they are purified, enlightened, and perfected; that they have blessed reunion with those whom they have loved and who have gone on before; and that they await in peace the Second Advent, the Resurrection, and the Judgment.

The second part consists in a series of "testimonies" on the subject of reunion with loved ones, grouped under certain relationships as, parents and children, brothers and sisters, husbands and wives, and friends. This part closes with a number of miscellaneous testimonies drawn from history and literature.

Princeton. C. W. HODGE.

PRACTICAL THEOLOGY

The Sword of the Spirit. Britain and America in the Great War. By JOSEPH FORT NEWTON, LITT.D., D.D., Minister of the City Temple. George H. Doran Co., 1918. Pp. 241. $1.25 net.

These are noble sermons from the point of view of literature and religion alike. The style is strong and clear, the illustrations are apt and admirable. They are drawn at times from the by-ways of literature, and are fresh and vivid. Patient thought and broad culture are everywhere manifest, and both mind and heart are touched.

Words of wisdom are spoken in the Prelude regarding the part that the Church must play in shaping the new world order. "Much is yet

uncertain, but it seems certain that the future will be shaped by three forces: The Spirit of Science, the Democratic Principle, and the Christian Evangel: and these three must learn to work together as partners and friends" (p. xvi). The diadem is placed upon the head of Christ: "He it is whom humanity will yet crown without a thorn—His Spirit our salvation, His love the hope of the soul, and His laws the only basis of a world-order wherein dwelleth righteousness and peace" (p. xvii).

While much is said of the war, the spirit of bitterness and hatred nowhere appears. The sins of the allied nations are recognized and deplored, even while the righteousness of their cause is maintained. "It is the prayer of a *righteous* man that availeth—but, alas, we are not righteous men, much less a righteous nation. England is not righteous. America, I know, is not righteous. Our cause is righteous, but we are not. We are fighting for justice, but we are not just. It would be easy to bring in a bill of particulars, but it is not needed. Our conscience indicts and convicts us before God, and our social order confirms the indictment. But enough: on this day we do not criticise one another, but all confess our sins, beseeching the cleansing mercy of God, that so our common prayer may be pure and true" (p. 156). This seems to be the spirit of the English pulpit, if we may judge from the sermons that come to us from across the sea.

Christ is everywhere exalted as the only hope of men and of nations. "Four years ago the Sermon on the Mount may have seemed quixotic; but today it reads like the Magna Charta of civilization" (p. 63). "There are influences in the world, of which the Cross is the changeless symbol, mightier than armies, vaster in their sweep, and more irresistible than the ruffian forces that destroy. . . . Thinking men see now more clearly than ever before that if the Spirit of Jesus, His truth, His laws, are not the leading principles of society, there is no civilization to be relied upon. For whatever theories men may hold as to the nature of Christ, they agree that the Divine Spirit of Him is our only hope" (pp. 62, 63).

Here and there, though rarely, exception may be taken. We read on p. 75, "If, therefore, men reject Christianity, ignore it, or do not even recognize its presence, it is because it has not been interpreted to them aright." But how does the idea that men will always accept Christianity if it is properly presented bear the test of history? The greatest of all interpreters was crucified. There are other influences that turn men from religion besides ignorance. The phrase *by the same token* recurs again and again without apparent force or significance. It should not be affirmed as if it were beyond question that "St. John was the only one of the Apostles who died a natural death; all the others suffered martyrdom in one form or another" (p. 185). Why should John have learned only on Patmos in extreme age of the death of Peter, which had occurred a number of years before (p. 186)? Certainly the Gospels do not give us the impression that

"the ministry of Jesus in Galilee was like a summer" (p. 224) even when contrasted with his ministry in Judea.

But these are minor blemishes, and do not detract from the value of the truth which is here presented in striking and attractive form. The book is a message of beauty, faith, hope, courage, that strengthens and inspires the soul. The intellectual and spiritual qualities are clearly revealed which have won for Dr. Newton the pulpit so long adorned by the genius and grace of Joseph Parker.

Princeton. J. Ritchie Smith.

The Pulpit in War Time. The Westminster Press, Philadelphia. 1918. Pp. vi. 173. 75 cents net.

The Introduction sets forth the origin and purpose of the book: "Ten men, all members of one religious body, all living in the same city, were invited to contribute a recently preached sermon to be incorporated in a book of war sermons, in order that uninformed critics might discover how alert the pulpits are to the exigencies of the hour; that bewildered people might be directed toward a straight path, and that preachers who have not yet been able to formulate their convictions might be helped to a clear and compelling message. Consequently these sermons were not prepared for publication. They do not follow any suggested line of thought. They are oral in style. They evidence the varying angles from which the issues of the war may be approached by ministers of the Gospel. It is probable that they give a fairly accurate idea of the way in which the pulpits of America are meeting the responsibilities laid upon them by President Wilson."

The sermons furnish additional illustration of the fact that the ministers of our country were not negligent of their duty nor lacking in the qualities of leadership during the great world crisis of the past five years. Few are the pulpits of the land, there is reason to believe, which have not spoken plainly and earnestly, as these Chicago pulpits have done, in defense of justice and righteousness, and sought to apply to the conditions of our time the principles of Christ. Prof. Zenos tells us (p. 57) that "Today the Monroe Doctrine must be logically classed with the ideas that have had their day and are outgrown." The great majority of Americans will without doubt endorse the contrary opinion of Dr. Wishart. Tribute is paid in several sermons to the ability and Christian character of President Wilson. A singular definition of democracy is given (p. 46): "every man should count as nothing more and nothing less than any other man in the eyes of his fellows." Does character, does ability, have nothing to do with the judgments that men pronounce upon one another?

The Apostles' Creed in the Twentieth Century. By Ferdinand S. Schenck, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Preaching and Sociology in the Theological Seminary at New Brunswick, N. J. Fleming H. Revell Co. 1918. Pp. 212. $1.25 net.

Two introductory chapters treat of the nature of belief, and of the

uses and abuses of a creed. Then the several articles of the Apostles' Creed are taken up in order, and treated in the light of "modern questionings and purposes." The author believed that there is a great craving for preaching of the apostolic kind today, and "this book is sent forth with the lofty design to foster that kind of preaching and to satisfy that kind of craving of the soul."

It is well that the truths embodied in this ancient symbol should be pressed upon the mind and heart of the church. The interpretation given here is just, the spirit reverent and devout. Christ is accorded his rightful place. The book should fill a useful place by presenting to men in clear and simple terms the great doctrines of the faith.

It must be said that the thought, while in the main correct, is apt to be rather obvious and commonplace, and little that is new or striking is said. The style at times is involved and awkward. "What the smallest quantity of knowledge of Jesus Christ may be enough to lead one to trust him, we need not ask" (p. 32). For other instances see pages 14 and 210. What is meant by the sentence: "Our own being is threefold—physical, mental, and moral: body, mind and soul may each use the word person" (p. 30)? The incorrect English of the Authorized Version in Matt. xvi:15 is followed: "Whom say ye that I am?" Christ is said to have lived long after the time of Cicero and Caesar (p. 91). Right appears for rite in p. 145. The reference to the personality of Satan is not clear (p. 137).

Princeton. J. RITCHIE SMITH.

Pathfinders of the Soul Country and Other Sermons for Today. By JOSEPH SIBLEY, D.D., Minister of Calvary Presbyterian Church, San Francisco, Cal. Fleming H. Revell Co. 1918. pp. 209. $1. net.

These sermons furnish interesting reading on ethical and social themes, but we miss the deeper notes of the Gospel. Just and eloquent tribute is paid to the power of Jesus, but the ultimate secret of that power is not disclosed. In Sermon IV it is taught that he is entitled to a place in the Hall of Fame by virtue of his intellectual leadership, his moral character, his spiritual purpose, but the redemptive work by which he draws all men unto him and wins the throne of heaven is never named. The personality of Jesus is exalted, his atonement seems to be studiously ignored. In Sermon VIII the Bible is honored for its moral grandeur, intellectual leadership, human interest, but there is no reference to the gospel. The great fundamental truths which are distinctive of Christianity receive scant attention from the preacher, so that while much is well said, eloquently said, upon matters of secondary importance, we feel that the great message of the ministry has not been delivered with fulness and power.

Augustine is said in one place to have been of the third century (p. 20), and again of the fifth (p. 23). Gilder's familiar lines are sadly mingled (p. 73). Father Hyacinthe appears twice upon one page as Hyacynth. On page 188 it is said, "Our church believes that all per-

sons, even ignorant savages, who have lived up to the best of their knowledge are uncondemned." How this statement may be made to accord with Chapter X of the *Confessions of Faith* is not made plain. Spirit is several times spelled with a small *s*, even in quotations from the epistles to the seven churches, and in the text of Sermon XII.

The Breath in the Winds and Other Sermons. By FREDERICK F. SHANNON, Pastor of the Reformed Church-on-the-Heights, Brooklyn. Fleming H. Revell Co. 1918. Pp. 173. $1 net.

These are sermons of decided interest. Important truth is presented in a striking way, though there is a nervous tension in the style, a straining after effect, which grows wearisome at times. We crave a little repose of manner, quietness of spirit. On page 96 we read of Athanasius, "To-day we may not be greatly interested in his theological debates. Indeed, they are and were of secondary importance; they never reveal the hidings of his power." With this superficial judgment compare these words from Dr. Newton's, *The Sword of the Spirit,* (p. 27): "Carlyle was not far wrong when he said that if Arius had won, Christianity would have dwindled to a legend."

The Unrecognized Christ. By JOHN GARDNER, D.D., Pastor New England Church, Chicago. Fleming H. Revell Co. 1918. Pp. 158. $1.00 net.

"The sermons contained in this volume were delivered at the Northfield General Conference. They were extemporaneous utterances and were delivered to promiscuous audiences. Yet they are the product of much thought, and express the profound conviction of the author that the hope of tomorrow lies in the rediscovery of Jesus the Christ." Why *re*discovery? Has the knowledge of Jesus the Christ faded from the minds of men?

The book is well written, interesting, instructive. The truth of the gospel is set forth in its beauty and power, and Christ is exalted as the blessed and only Savior.

On page 59 *Andrew* instead of *Peter* is named as one of our Lord's companions on the Mount of Transfiguration. It is said that the Church is just as impotent today as the disciples were in the presence of the demoniac. Yet immediately afterward a glowing picture is given us of the triumphs of Christianity. Have not those triumphs been achieved through the Church? The Church is not impotent, never has been impotent, never can be impotent, so long as the living Christ inhabits it. That the Church has never discharged the full measure of its duty of course is true, but it has never failed to manifest in some degree the power of God. On page 153 we read, "Try to get some poet to write an epic concerning some man who embarked upon a great adventure, strange and awful, but who, in the moment of his soul's crisis, failed. It cannot be." But is not that essentially the theme of *Paradise Lost*? On the same page are found sentences which leave an unpleasant impression, even though they are uttered as the

author avers, with the utmost reverence. "Jesus Christ in going to Calvary, having taken upon him the likeness of men, was no better than he ought to have been. He did not do more than he ought to have done." The words seem to assert that his obedience and sacrifice were a matter of debt and not of grace, and the statement should be more carefully guarded. It contains an element of truth, but in a form needlessly extreme and offensive.

Princeton. J. RITCHIE SMITH.

The Life of Service: Some Christian Doctrines from Paul's Experience in the Epistle to the Romans. By JAMES I. VANCE, D.D., LL.D., Fleming H. Revell Co. 1919. Pp. 219. $1.25 net.

The book contains a series of addresses given at Northfield in August 1917. The attempt is made to show how Paul's doctrines were related to his experience, and the result is a volume in which vigor of thought and power of expression are happily blended. The great doctrines of the Word are expounded and defended. "The Bible we believe to be infallibly inspired, and inerrant in all questions of faith and practice" (p. 191). Christ is exalted, and his vicarious atonement is presented as the only hope of sinful men. A chapter is devoted to Predestination—Paul's Doctrine of the Divine Decree. Here Dr. Vance tells us that "We may lay it down as a safe rule to begin with that the Christian should go fearlessly and unhesitatingly wherever the Bible may lead" (p. 120). With this principle in mind he accepts the doctrine of the divine decree by which all things are ordered. "Predestination is in the Bible. There can be no more doubt of it than that the sun shines" (p. 122). We have here not milk for babes but meat for men.

There are statements open to question. In the light of recent history it is curious to read such words as these: "Christ says to those who would enter his service: 'You must give up everything, and be willing to go anywhere. . . . If you follow me you must give up home and parents, ease and comfort, and maybe life itself.' Any earthly government that would attempt to recruit an army on this basis would soon go out of business. It is enough to frighten the volunteer spirit to death" (p. 85). Yet in this country and England alone millions of men freely offered themselves to serve and suffer and die. It is rash to say that the Bible is not an essential of Christianity (p. 112). Christianity was never without a Bible, for the new dispensation is built upon the old. As long as we do not see the Savior as he is, we are dependent upon the Word and the Spirit for our knowledge of him. This sentence is obscure: "If a whole Christianity existed previous to the Council of Nice or the Westminster Assembly, then the acceptance of the theological views Jesus put to them is no more essential to Christian truth than ritualism is to worship or hierarchy to life" (p. 110). It is not easy to grasp the meaning here, but there seems to be some confusion of thought. Truth is not bounded by chronological lines. If any Council or Assembly sets forth essential truth,

it does not cease to be essential by reason of its date. It would be as reasonable to affirm that the formulas of modern science are of no value because nature is much older than they. And if Jesus was the teacher of Council or Assembly, why is not his teaching as authoritative as if it were addressed to Peter and John? What is meant by the question, "How is the beast in man to be dethroned and the angel in man to be imprisoned?" (p. 31). Released from prison seems to be intended. Paul would be surprised to learn that he did not attempt to impose his views on others (p. 66), unless *impose* is used in a very narrow sense. The Revised Version appears to be seldom used. On page 83 *Spirit* twice appears with a small *s*.

The book is written in a devout and earnest spirit, in a clear, strong style, and is well suited to impress the great truths of Paul's great letter.

Princeton. J. Ritchie Smith.

The New Opportunity of the Church. By Robert E. Speer. The Macmillan Company. New York. 60 cents net.

This little book is both instructive and stimulating. Its timely appearance will doubtless help the Church to see more clearly her new tasks and appreciate more fully the unparalleled opportunities which the world war has opened up for her. It is a book that inspires confidence in the Church and assurance of her ability to deal with the problems of the new day. The author, however, is not blind to the danger of underestimating our tasks, and of losing in the hour of victory some of the ideals for which the war was fought. The danger of a moral relaxation and a return to the materialism which dominated the nation prior to the war is earnestly set forth by the writer in the early part of his work. The Church, he says, must meet this tendency with a deeper and more persistent spirituality. Dr. Speer strikes a much needed note when he reminds us that the real business of the Church is religion. "The war has taught us that the world is not safe where the ideals of Christ are ignored" and it is the business of the Church to keep these ideals before men and supply them with convictions that will and must sustain them. The author's treatment of the effect of the war upon the soldier at the front regarding the existence of God is most helpful and reassuring. The war, he says, instead of leading men to lose their faith in God, as some believed it would, has inspired them with a stronger and firmer belief in Him, and he adds: "This war above everything else has illumined and glorified the figure of Jesus Christ. Many ideas and institutions have been discredited by the war, but Christ towers alike above all the wreckage and all the glory of war. Some thought they saw Him in battle, others knew they saw Him in the hospital." The war has swept away a great deal but it has left God and Christ more real to the soul.

Dr. Speer believes that if we are to carry out a constructive policy and meet the new conditions which confront us, there must be in peace as in war inter-denominational coöperation, and the war has

taught us that this is no longer a dream but can be a reality in peace as in war.

In the latter part of his book the author makes a strong plea for missions and for volunteers in a field that demands the highest type of heroism. He declares that the ideals for which the war was fought are the ideals which in the mission field have dominated and inspired the work of the missionary. If then we are ready at the call of our country to sacrifice our life for these ideals, can we in conscience refuse the call of Christ to maintain them, even at the cost of life, in the mission field?

The book is a strong, helpful message to the Church and ought to be widely read.

Princeton. D. B. TOMKINS.

PERIODICAL LITERATURE

American Church Monthly, New York, April: D. CHARLES WHITE, Safeguards of Democracy; BURTON SCOTT EASTON, The Gospel according to St. Luke; FRANK H. HALLOCK, Work of the Holy Spirit in the Church; CHARLES C. EDMUNDS, Does the World Move?; CAROLINE F. LITTLE, Nature—an Aid to Meditation. *The Same*, May: ARTHUR C. A. HALL, The Open Pulpit; ARTHUR W. JENKS, The Reformed Episcopal Church; NEIL E. STANLEY, The Function of the Theological Seminary; CLERE UNWIN, Lecture Platform or Pulpit?; HENRY K. PIERCE, For What does the Prayer Book Stand? *The Same*, June: GEORGE ZABRISKIE, Proposals for an Approach towards Unity; CLARENCE A. MANNING, Ethical Teaching of Tolstoy; CHARLES C. EDMUNDS, The Gospel according to St. Mark; HAMILTON SCHUYLER, The World Moves but Whither?

American Journal of Theology, Chicago, April: GEORGE CROSS, Federation of the Christian Churches in America—an Interpretation; J. WARSCHAUER, Jesus as a Teacher: Toward an Interpretation; HERBERT L. STEWART, Lord Morley's Relation to History, to Theology, and to the Churches; CHARLES C. TORREY, Fact and Fancy in Theories Concerning Acts (conclusion); A. WAKEFIELD SLATEN, Qualitative use of NOMOS in the Pauline Epistles.

Anglican Theological Review, Lancaster, May: ELMER T. MERRILL, Alleged Persecutions of Christians by Domitian; FREDERICK C. GRANT, Critique of *Matthew's Sayings of Jesus* by Castor; EDWIN S. LANE, Monastery of St. Honoratius on the Island of Lerins; H. C. ACKERMAN, Reconceptualization as a Principle of Exegesis.

Biblotheca Sacra, Oberlin, April: ANDREW GILLIES, Need of a New Conception of God; OLIVE M. WINCHESTER, Sin in the Light of Today; W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS, The German Attitude to the Bible; WILLIAM H. BATES, Priest—Priesthood; HAROLD M. WIENER, Contributions to a new Theory of the Composition of the Pentateuch (iii); W. A. JARREL, The Hun and the Imprecatory Psalms; H. M. WIENER,

The text of Numbers 21:14 ff.; JOHN R. WIGHTMAN, Naville on the Composition and Sources of Genesis.

Catholic Historical Review, Washington, April: EDWIN A. RYAN, Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction in the Spanish Colonies; HERBERT E. BOLTON, Father Escobar's Relations to the Oñate Expedition to California; FREDERICK J. ZWIERLEIN, Bishop McQuade of Rochester; LEO STOCK, An Early Jesuit Work on the Writing of History; HERBERT I. PRIESTLEY, The Pedro Fages MS. on California.

Church Quarterly Review, London, April: A. ROBERTSON, Teaching Office of the Church; G. A. COOKE, The Bible and the Church; W. R. MATTHEWS, God as Creative Personality; A. E. BAKER, Present Relations between Anglicans and Nonconformists; F. L. BRERETON, The National Church; GEORGE GARDNER, Some Results of the Reformation in Germany; J. W. HUNKIN, St. Luke and Josephus; D. C. SIMPSON, Messianic Prophecy and the Jewish Problem.

Constructive Quarterly, New York, March: WILLIAM TEMPLE, World's Need of the Church; BISHOP MCCONNELL, Some Significant Agreements; J. CALVET, French Catholics and the Russian Church; H. L. GOUDGE, The Churchmanship of Jesus Christ; W. P. PATERSON, Dr. Denney's Theology; BURTON S. EASTON, St. Paul and the Sacraments; F. R. TENNANT, Divine Love and the World's Evil; P. T. FORSYTH, The Inner Life of Christ; S. A. B. MERCER, Meditation in Religous Thought; S. M. ZWEMER, Christianity the Final Religion. *The Same,* June: LOUIS BRÉHIER, Saint Sophia and the History of the Church; J. H. SHAKESPEARE, Church Unity: Its position and Outlook in England: ANTONIOS OF KIEV, Concerning the Dogma of Redemption; H. M. VAN NES, Sound Doctrine and Living Dogma; EUGENE STOCK, Kikuyu Rediviva; T. R. GLOVER, Reconciliation of Freedom and Religion; H. C. ACKERMAN, Christian Conception of Freedom and Some Modern Tendencies; ROBERT FALCONER, Moral Standards in Primitive Christianity; EDWARD J. BRAILSFORD, New Power for the New Age; HENRY F. COPE, Trends in Religious Literature.

East & West, London, April: EUGENE STOCK, Hudson Taylor and the China Inland Mission; CARR SMITH, Religion in Australian Primary Schools; A. J. MARRIS, Everyday Difficulties of Indian Christians; F. JONES, Among the Chinese Labour Groups in France; H. A. POPLEY, The Evangelistic Movement in the Indian Church; C. C. WATTS, Upcountry Work in South Africa; D. C. L. DUNLOP, The Kumbh Mela at Allahabad; FRANK WESTON, Mr. Keable's indictment of African Priests.

Expositor, London, April: W. SANDAY, Meaning of the Atonement; J. T. DEAN, Church Crisis in the First Century; JAMES MOFFATT, Expository Notes on Acts; H. A. A. KENNEDY, Philo's Conception of God's Approach to Man; JOHN MCKENZIE, Hindu Doctrine of Karma; A. E. GARVIE, Jesus in the Fourth Gospel. *The Same,* May: J. A. ROBERTSON, Some Parables and an Apocalypse of the Road; H. A. A. KENNEDY, Philo on Union with God; MAURICE JONES, A New Chron-

ology of the Life of Paul; JANE T. STODDART, A Great Jewish Scholar; E. J. GOODSPEED, The Date of Acts. *The Same,* June: RENDEL HARRIS, St. Paul's Use of Testimonies in the Epistle to the Romans; H. J. WHITE, On the Saying Attributed to our Lord in John 2:19; MAURICE JONES, A New Chronology of the Life of St. Paul; F. R. TENNANT, Doctrine of the Trinity: in Philosophy; T. H. BINDLEY, Earliest Baptismal Formula and Creed.

Expository Times, Edinburgh, March: Notes of Recent Exposition; HAROLD SMITH, Kingdom of God in the Ante-Nicene Fathers; GEORGE JACKSON, Archbishop Leighton; SYDNEY CAVE, Christianity the World Religion. *The Same,* April: Notes of Recent Exposition; F. R. TENNANT, Theological Significance of the Early Chapters of Genesis; SYDNEY CAVE, Christianity the World Religion; JOHN DOUGLAS, The Incarnation: Some Implications for the Church. *The Same,* May: Notes of Recent Exposition; GEORGE MILLIGAN, Henry Barclay Swete; F. R. TENNANT, Moral Arguments for the Existence of God; THOMAS ADAMSON, Kaiseriana.

Harvard Theological Review, Cambridge, April: J. LOEWENBERG, Multiplicity and the Social Order; WILLIAM A. BROWN, The Seminary of Tomorrow; FRANCIS J. MCCONNELL, The Causes of Pre-Millenarianism; F. J. FOAKES-JACKSON, The Kingdom of God in Acts and the "City of God."

International Journal of Ethics, Concord, April: C. DELISLE BURNS, De Ecclesia; ALFRED H. LLOYD, When Gods are Born; JOHN M. MECKLIN, The International Conscience; M. W. ROBIESON, The Theory of Morals on a Class Basis; WILBUR M. URBAN, How Are Moral Judgments on Groups and Associations Possible?; RICHARD ROBERTS, Problems of Conscience; DURANT DRAKE, Will the League of Nations Work?; E. C. MOORE, Educational Reconstruction; MARGARET JOURDAIN, The Victorian Spirit.

Interpreter, London, April: F. B. JEVONS, Primitive Theory of Sacrifice; H. J. D. ASTLEY, Survival of Primitive Cults in the Old Testament; NEVILLE GORTON, Miracles and Sonship; F. W. ORDE WARD, Perfection; E. J. MARTIN, Christian Idea of Liberty; A. WALFORD DEAKIN, Conservation of the Soul unto Everlasting Life; H. O. CAVALIER, The Temptation of Jesus.

Irish Theological Quarterly, Dublin, April: W. MORAN, Some Causes of the Present Social Unrest; E. MAGUIRE, Facts and Theories of Life; CLAUDE C. H. WILLIAMSON, A Note on Mediaeval Sanctuary; M. J. O'DONNELL, The *Ne Temere* and the Code.

Jewish Quarterly Review, London, January and April: ROMAIN BUTIN, Some Leaves of an Egyptian Jewish Ritual; ISRAEL EFROS, The Memorat Ha-Maor; JULIAN MORGENSTERN, Kedesh-Naphtali and Ta-'anach; C. DUSCHINSKY, The Rabbinate of the Great Synagogue, London, from 1756 to 1842.

Journal of Negro History, Lancaster, April: ROBERT E. PARK, Conflict and Fusion of Cultures with Special Reference to the Negro;

George F. Zook, The Company of Royal Adventurers trading with Africa.

Journal of the Society of Oriental Research, Chicago, March: Samuel A. B. Mercer, Egyptian Morals of the Middle Kingdom; John A. Maynard, A Lamentation to Aruru; Samuel A. B. Mercer, An Old Testament Archaeological Bibliography for 1914 to 1917 Inclusive; Stephen Langdon, Contribution to Assyrian Lexicography.

Journal of Theological Studies, London, April: C. H. Turner, Antonio Spagnolo; C. F. Burney, A Fresh Examination of the Hebrew Tenses; T. Stephenson, Old Testament Quotations Peculiar to Matthew; J. P. Arendzen, Ante-Nicene Interpretations of the Sayings on Divorce; V. McNabb, Was the Rule of St. Augustine written for St. Melania the younger?; I. W. Slotki, A lost Selah, and Psalm 85:9(8).

London Quarterly Review, London, April: W. T. Davison, A Great Mystic; Eugene Stock, The New Challenge to British Christendom; Frank Ballard, The Eternal Question in the Light of Modern Science; James Lewis, The Curse of India; T. H. S. Escott, National Psychology in War-Time; James Lindsay, Philosophical Influences in Modern English Literature; St. Nihal Singh, Africa in the World Settlement.

Lutheran Church Review, Philadelphia, April: F. A. Bowers, Lutheran Preaching in the Light of the Training Camps; P. George Sieger, Lutheran Preaching in the Light of Our Training Camps; George Hodges, Function of the Church in the World of To-Day; L. A. Fox, Patriotism of the Germans in the Colonial South (ii); George H. Trabert, Home Missions in the West and Northwest; W. A. Zundel, English Mission Work in the Northwest; F. H. Knubel, Essentials of a Catholic Spirit; H. E. Jacobs, Constructive Lutheranism.

Lutheran Quarterly, Gettysburg, April: David H. Bauslin, The Collapse of a Bad Theory; J. L. Neve, Union Movements between Lutherans and Reformed; J. A. Singmaster, Evidences for the Existence of God; A. Hiller, History of the First Ten Years of the Synod of New York.

Methodist Quarterly Review, Nashville, April: Frank M. Thomas, The Father of Modern Democracy; C. M. Bishop, Christian Basis of Civilization; John W. Buckham, Book of Unity; R. T. Webb, The War and Universal Brotherhood; Edwin W. Bowen, The Poet of Democracy; Watson B. Duncan, Providential Mission of America; John J. Ransom, Wanderings of the Proviso; Temple Bodley, "More Democracy"; Ernest Lloyd, Religion in the Public Schools; J. E. McCulloch, Our Paramount Social Problems; Frank M. Stewart, At the Grave of John Stewart.

Methodist Review, New York, May-June: Daniel Dorchester, The Imponderables and a Better World Order; Alice M. Robertson, What is Deaconess Work?; Lewis H. Chrisman, Lowell and his Interpretation of Life; Charles E. Locke, Listening to God; Stanley W. Wiant, The Minister as a Recruiting Officer for Religious Life

Workers; JAMES M. DIXON, Paradise Lost in the Light of To-Day; PAUL NIXON, Two Things are Certain; HUGH R. ORR, The Religion of the Common Good.

Monist, Chicago, April: HERBERT L. STEWART, Carlyle's Place in Philosophy; BERTRAND RUSSELL, Philosophy of Logical Atomism; S. N. PATTEN, The Divided Self; WILLIAM M. McGOVERN, Notes on Mahayana Buddhism; M. MILMAN, Noah and his Family; PAUL HAUPT, The Child in Luke 1:76.

Moslem World, Cooperstown, April: GEORGE SWAN, Patience in Moslem Evangelization; SIRAJ UD DIN AND H. A. WALTER, An Indian Sufi Hymn; H. J. LANE-SMITH, Illiteracy among Indian Moslems; JENNY DE MAYER, Christian Literature for Russian Moslems; PAUL M. HINKHOUSE, Islam in Siam; H. E. E. HAYES, The Crescent as the Symbol of Islam; EVELINE A. THOMPSON, Constantinople College for Women; F. J. BARNY, Moslem Idea of 'Ilm; MARGUERITE B. WALKER, All India Ladies' Conference; WILLIAM H. HALL, Mohammedans in Syria during the War; GEORGE WHITE, Evil Spirits and the Evil Eye in Turkey.

Reformed Church Review, Lancaster, April: HOWARD B. GROSE, Emancipating Influence of the Renaissance; CHARLES E. SCHAEFFER, Call of God for this Hour; C. B. SCHNEDER, The Minister at His Best; A. O. REITER, The Eschatology of Jesus; ALFRED N. SAYRES, The Atonement; GEORGE W. RICHARDS, The Holy Roman Empire and the Growth of Human Freedom; H. M. J. KLEIN, In Memoriam of Dr. N. C. Schaeffer; THEODORE F. HERMAN, Passing of Dr. N. C. Shaeffer.

Southwestern Journal of Theology, Fort Worth, April: J. M. PRICE, Seminary Life; E. C. DORGAN, Origen and his Influence on Preaching; A. L. VAIL, Is Written Revelation from God Reasonable?; F. M. McCONNELL, How far Shall Baptists Co-operate with Other Denominations?; O. E. BRYAN, Which One?; SAMUEL J. PORTER, Spiritual Experience as the Rival Test of Truth; JEFF D. RAY, Rural Church Outlook; MILLIARD A. JENKINS, A World Problem for Baptists; C. B. WILLIAMS, The Universal Note in New Testament Christianity.

Union Seminary Review, Richmond, April: W. W. MOORE, Doctor Schauffler; HENRY L. SMITH, The Hand of God in the World War; ANDREW W. BLACKWOOD, The Young Minister's Study; RUSSELL CECIL, Some Lessons which Ministers May Learn from Rev. William A. Sunday; A. M. FRASER, The Tithe; WILLIAM C. BUCHANAN, Place of Prayer in World-wide Evangelism.

Yale Review, New Haven, April: WILLIAM E. DODD, Converging Democracies; RANDOLPH BOURNE, History of a Literary Radical; HENRY S. CANBY, War's Ending; V. R. SAVIC, The Passing of the Balkans; VICTOR PLARR, The Mind of Alsace; S. A. KORFF, Russian and French Revolutions; CHARLES H. JUDD, A National Educational System; WILLIAM KENT, Land Tenure and Public Policy; JOHN J. CHAPMAN, Craftsman and Critic.

Bilychnis, Roma, Marzo: MARIO ROSSI, Religione e religioni in Italia

secondo l'ultimo censimento; Mancanze di garanzie pel nuovo Codice di Diritto canonico; Carla Cadorna, I ritrovi spirituali di Viterbo nel 1541; Mario Falchi, Una visita all'Ingegnere Kha; Emmanuel, L'etere e il suo possible valore psichico. *The Same*, Aprile: Giovanni Marchi, Il "confiteor" dei giovani; Giovanni E. Meille, Psicologia di combattenti cristiani; Paolo Tucci, Uno scritto di M. Lutero: "Se la gente di guerra possa, anche essa, essere in istato beato"; Emmanuel La religione di un letterato. *The Same.* Maggio: Mario Falchi, Le condizioni religiose della Società delle Nazione"; Paolo E. Pavolini, Poesi religiose polacca; Mancanze di garanzie nello schema e nel nuovo Codice di Diritto Canonico.

Ciencia Tomista, Madrid, Marzo-Abril: Luis G. A. Getino, Centenario y Cartulario de nuestra Communidad; Vincente B. de Heredia, Catedráticos de Sagrada Escritura en la Universidad de Alcalá durante el siglio xvi; P. Lumbreras, La duda metôdica Descartes; Juan G. Arintero, La verdadera perfección cristiana implida vida mística. *The Same*, Mayo-Junio: Luis G. A. Getino, Centenario y cartulario de nuestra Communidad (con.); Alberto Colunga, La obra de los seis dias (conclusion); Pedro N. de Medio, Evolucionismo y transformismo según la ciencia (con.); J. G. Arintero, La verdadera perfección cristiana implica vida mistica (con.).

Gereformeerd Theologisch Tijdschrift, Baarn, Februari: F. W. Grosheide, De Chronologie van het leven van Paulus; J. Waterink, De studie van de "Volksziel," noodig voor ambtelijken arbeid; A. A. van Schelven, Artikel 12 der Kerkorde. *The Same*, Maart: J. Ridderbos, De Boom des levens; A. G. Honig, Een boek over de Ethische Richting; T. Hoekstra, De beste preekmethode. *The Same*, April: G. Ch. Aalders, Palestijnsche vertellingen; Joh. Jansen, Nog eens; De verlating van den dienst des Woords; T. Hoekstra, De Tekstkeuze.

Nieuwe Theologische Studiën, Groningen, I:8: F. M. Th. Böhl, Exegetica; H. Th. Obbink, Uit ouden en nieuwen tijd. *The Same*, I:9: J. van Wageningen, Algemeene Psychologie van de vrouw bij de latere Grieken en de Romeien; J. Th. Ubbink, Seneca en Paulus; H. M. van Nes, Zending en Kerkrecht. *The Same*, I:10: Joh. de Groot, Palestijnsche trekken in Genesis 2 en 3; H. Th. Obbink, Historica en Filosofica; W. J. Aalders, Quakerisme.

Revue de Theologie et de Philosophie, Lausanne, Janvier-Avril: Charles Dombre, Le rôle de l'imitation chez les mystiques; Edouard Logoz, La philosophie de l'histoire de saint Augustin; Victor Martin, Les papyrus du Nouveau Testament et l'histoire du texte.

CORRIGENDUM

On the first page of the July issue (p. 345) the last line of the quotation from the *City of God* was accidentally omitted. The line reads:

eloquence not of words but of things.—AUGUSTINE.[1]